arXiv:1512.06660v2 [math.CO] 26 Jun 2016

CONSTRUCTIONS AND BOUNDS FOR MIXED-DIMENSION SUBSPACE CODES

In memoriam Axel Kohnert (1962–2013)

Thomas Honold

Department of Information and Electronic Engineering
Zhejiang University, 38 Zheda Road, 310027 Hangzhou, China

Michael Kiermaier

Mathematisches Institut, Universität Bayreuth, D-95440 Bayreuth, Germany

Sascha Kurz

Mathematisches Institut, Universität Bayreuth, D-95440 Bayreuth, Germany

Abstract. Codes in finite projective spaces equipped with the subspace distance have been proposed for error control in random linear network coding. The resulting so-called *Main Problem of Subspace Coding* is to determine the maximum size $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d)$ of a code in $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$ with minimum subspace distance d. Here we completely resolve this problem for $d \geq v-1$. For $d=v-2$ we present some improved bounds and determine $\mathrm{A}_q(5,3) = 2q^3+2$ (all q), $\mathrm{A}_2(7,5) = 34$. We also provide an exposition of the known determination of $\mathrm{A}_q(v,2)$, and a table with exact results and bounds for the numbers $\mathrm{A}_2(v,d)$, $v \leq 7$.

1. Introduction

For a prime power $q > 1$ let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be the finite field with q elements and $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ the standard vector space of dimension $v \geq 0$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$. The set of all subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$, ordered by the incidence relation $\subseteq$, is called *$(v-1)$-dimensional (coordinate) projective geometry over $\mathbb{F}_q$* and denoted by $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$. It forms a finite modular geometric lattice with meet $X \wedge Y = X \cap Y$ and join $X \vee Y = X + Y$.

The study of geometric and combinatorial properties of $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$ and related structures forms the subject of *Galois Geometry*—a mathematical discipline with a long and renowned history of its own but also with links to several other areas of discrete mathematics and important applications in contemporary industry, such as cryptography and error-correcting codes. For a comprehensive introduction to the core subjects of Galois Geometry readers may consult the three-volume treatise [28, 29, 30]. More recent developments are surveyed in [3].

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 94B05, 05B25, 51E20; Secondary 51E14, 51E22, 51E23.

Key words and phrases. Galois geometry, network coding, subspace code, partial spread.

Th. Honold gratefully acknowledges financial support for a short visit to the University of Bayreuth in March 2015, where part of this research was done. His work was also supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 61571006. M. Kiermaier and S. Kurz were supported by EU COST Action IC1104. In addition, S. Kurz's work was supported through the DFG project "Ganzzahlige Optimierungsmodelle für Subspace Codes und endliche Geometrie" (DFG grant KU 2430/3-1).

It has long been recognized that classical error-correcting codes, which were designed for point-to-point communication over a period of now more than 60 years, can be studied in the Galois Geometry framework. Recently, through the seminal work of Koetter, Kschischang and Silva [36, 43, 44], it was discovered that essentially the same is true for the network-error-correcting codes developed by Cai, Yeung, Zhang and others [47, 48, 25]. Information in packet networks with underlying packet space $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ can be transmitted using subspaces of $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$ as codewords and secured against errors (both random and adversarial errors) by selecting the codewords subject to a lower bound on their mutual distance in a suitable metric on $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$, resembling the classical block code selection process based on the Hamming distance properties.

Accordingly, we call any set $\mathcal{C}$ of subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ a *q-ary subspace code of packet length v*. Two widely used distance measures for subspace codes (motivated by an information-theoretic analysis of the Koetter-Kschischang-Silva model) are the so-called *subspace distance*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d_S}(X,Y) &= \dim(X+Y) - \dim(X\cap Y) \\ &= \dim(X) + \dim(Y) - 2\cdot\dim(X\cap Y) \\ &= 2\cdot\dim(X+Y) - \dim(X) - \dim(Y) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

and *injection distance*

$$\mathrm{d_I}(X,Y) = \max\{\dim(X),\dim(Y)\} - \dim(X\cap Y). \tag{2}$$

With this the *minimum distance* in the subspace metric of a subspace code $\mathcal{C}$ containing at least two codewords is defined as

$$\mathrm{d_S}(\mathcal{C}) := \min\{\mathrm{d_S}(X,Y); X,Y\in\mathcal{C}, X\neq Y\}, \tag{3}$$

and that in the injection metric as

$$\mathrm{d_I}(\mathcal{C}) := \min\{\mathrm{d_I}(X,Y); X,Y\in\mathcal{C}, X\neq Y\}.^{1} \tag{4}$$

A subspace code $\mathcal{C}$ is said to be a *constant-dimension code* (or *Grassmannian code*) if all codewords in $\mathcal{C}$ have the same dimension over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Since $\mathrm{d_S}(X,Y) = 2\cdot\mathrm{d_I}(X,Y)$ whenever X and Y are of the same dimension, we need not care about the specific metric ($\mathrm{d_S}$ or $\mathrm{d_I}$) used when dealing with constant-dimension codes. Moreover, $\mathrm{d_S}(\mathcal{C}) = 2\cdot\mathrm{d_I}(\mathcal{C})$ in this case and hence the minimum subspace distance of a constant-dimension code is always an even integer.

As in the classical case of block codes, the transmission rate of a network communication system employing a subspace code $\mathcal{C}$ is proportional to $\log(\#\mathcal{C})$. Hence, given a lower bound on the minimum distance $\mathrm{d_S}(\mathcal{C})$ or $\mathrm{d_I}(\mathcal{C})$ (providing, together with other parameters such as the physical characteristics of the network and the decoding algorithm used, a specified data integrity level[2]), we want the code size $M = \#\mathcal{C}$ to be as large as possible. It is clear that constant-dimension codes usually are not maximal in this respect and, as a consequence, we need to look at general mixed-dimension subspace codes for a rigorous solution of this optimization problem.

In the remaining part of this article we will restrict ourselves to the subspace distance $\mathrm{d_S}$. From a mathematical point of view, any v-dimensional vector space

[1] Sometimes it will be convenient to allow $\#\mathcal{C}\leq 1$, in which case we formally set $\mathrm{d_S}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathrm{d_I}(\mathcal{C}) = \infty$.

[2] This integrity level is usually specified by an upper bound on the probability of transmission error allowed.

V over $\mathbb{F}_q$ is just as good as the standard space $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ (since $V \cong \mathbb{F}_q^v$), and it will sometimes be convenient to work with non-standard spaces (for example with the extension field $\mathbb{F}_{q^v}/\mathbb{F}_q$, in order to exploit additional structure). Hence we fix the following terminology:

Definition 1.1. A *q-ary (v, M, d) subspace code*, also referred to as a *subspace code with parameters $(v, M, d)_q$*, is a set $\mathcal{C}$ of subspaces of $V \cong \mathbb{F}_q^v$ with $M = \#\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathrm{d_S}(\mathcal{C}) = d$. The space V is called the *ambient space* of $\mathcal{C}$.[3] The *dimension distribution* of $\mathcal{C}$ is the sequence $\delta(\mathcal{C}) = (\delta_0, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_v)$ defined by $\delta_k = \#\{X \in \mathcal{C}; \dim(X) = k\}$. Two subspace codes $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ are said to be *isomorphic* if there exists an isometry (with respect to the subspace metric) $\phi\colon V_1 \to V_2$ between their ambient spaces satisfying $\phi(\mathcal{C}_1) = \mathcal{C}_2$.

It is easily seen that isomorphic subspace codes $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ must have the same alphabet size q and the same ambient space dimension $v = \dim(V_1) = \dim(V_2)$. The dimension distribution of a subspace code may be seen as a q-analogue of the Hamming weight distribution of an ordinary block code. As in the block code case, the quantities $\delta_k = \delta_k(\mathcal{C})$ are non-negative integers satisfying $\sum_{k=0}^{v} \delta_k = M = \#\mathcal{C}$.

Problem (Main Problem of Subspace Coding[4])**.** *For a given prime power $q \geq 2$, packet length $v \geq 1$ and minimum distance $d \in \{1, \ldots, v\}$ determine the maximum size $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d) = M$ of a q-ary (v, M, d) subspace code and—as a refinement—classify the corresponding optimal codes up to subspace code isomorphism.*

Although our ultimate focus will be on the main problem for general mixed-dimension subspace codes as indicated, we will often build upon known results for the same problem restricted to constant-dimension codes, or mixed-dimension codes with only a small number of nonzero dimension frequencies δ_k. For this it will be convenient to denote, for subsets $T \subseteq \{0, 1, \ldots, v\}$, the maximum size of a $(v, M, d')_q$ subspace code $\mathcal{C}$ with $d' \geq d$ and $\delta_k(\mathcal{C}) = 0$ for all $k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, v\} \setminus T$ by $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T)$, and refer to subspace codes subject to this dimension restriction accordingly as $(v, M, d; T)_q$ codes. In other words, the set T specifies the dimensions of the subspaces which can be chosen as a codeword of a $(v, M, d; T)_q$ code, and determining the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T)$ amounts to extending the main problem to $(v, M, d; T)_q$ codes.[5]

While a lot of research has been done on the determination of the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; k) = \mathrm{A}_q(v, d; \{k\})$, the constant-dimension case, only very few results are known for $\#T > 1$.[6]

[3] Strictly speaking, the ambient space is part of the definition of a subspace code and we should write $(V, \mathcal{C})$ in place of $\mathcal{C}$. Since the ambient space is usually clear from the context, we have adopted the more convenient shorthand "$\mathcal{C}$".

[4] The name has been chosen to emphasize the analogy with the "main problem of (classical) coding theory", which commonly refers to the problem of optimizing the parameters (n, M, d) of ordinary block codes [38], and should not be taken literally as meaning "the most important problem in this area".

[5] In order to make $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T)$ well-defined for all $d \in \{1, \ldots, v\}$ and ensure the usual monotonicity property $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T) \geq \mathrm{A}_q(v, d'; T)$ for $d \leq d'$, it is necessary to take the maximum in the definition of $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T)$ over all codes with $d' \geq d$ (and not only over codes with exact minimum distance d). The definition of $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d)$ didn't require such extra care, since in the unrestricted case we can alter dimensions of codewords freely and hence transform any $(v, M, d')_q$ code with $d' \geq d$ into a $(v, M, d)_q$ code.

[6] Strictly speaking, this remark is true only in the binary case. For $q > 2$ even in the constant-dimension case very few results are known.

The purpose of this paper is to advance the knowledge in the mixed-dimension case and determine the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d)$ for further parameters q, v, d. In this regard we build upon previous work of several authors, as is nicely surveyed by Etzion in [15, Sect. 4]. In the parlance of Etzion's survey, our contribution partially solves Research Problem 20.[7]

The Gaussian binomial coefficients $\begin{bmatrix} v \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q$ give the number of k-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ (and of any ambient space $V \cong \mathbb{F}_q^v$) and satisfy

$$\begin{bmatrix} v \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{q^{v-i}-1}{q^{k-i}-1} = q^{k(v-k)} \cdot \big(1+\mathrm{o}(1)\big) \quad \text{for } q \to \infty. \tag{5}$$

Since these numbers grow very quickly, especially for $k \approx v/2$, the exact determination of $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d)$ appears to be an intricate task—except for some special cases. Even more challenging is the refined problem of enumerating the isomorphism types of the corresponding optimal subspace codes (i.e. those of size $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d)$). In some cases such an exhaustive enumeration is currently infeasible due to the large number of isomorphism types or due to computational limitations. In this context we regard the determination of certain structural restrictions as a precursor to an exhaustive classification.

The remaining part of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we provide further terminology and a few auxiliary concepts and results, which have proved useful for the subsequent subspace code optimization/classification. In Section 3 we determine the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d)$ for general q, v and some special values of d. Finally, in Section 4 we further discuss the binary case $q=2$ and determine the numbers $\mathrm{A}_2(v,d)$, as well as the corresponding number of isomorphism classes of optimal codes, for $v \le 7$ and all but a few hard-to-resolve cases. For the remaining cases we provide improved bounds for $\mathrm{A}_2(v,d)$ using a variety of methods. On the reader's side we will assume at least some rudimentary knowledge of subspace coding, which e.g. can be acquired by reading the survey [17] or its predecessor [15].

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **The Automorphism Group of $\big(\mathrm{PG}(V),\mathrm{d_S}\big)$.** Let us start with a description of the automorphism group of the metric space $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$ relative to the subspace distance. Since a general v-dimensional ambient space V is isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ as a vector space over $\mathbb{F}_q$ (and hence isometric to $(\mathbb{F}_q^v,\mathrm{d_S})$), this yields a description of all automorphism groups $\mathrm{Aut}(V,\mathrm{d_S})$ and also of all isometries between different ambient spaces $(V_1,\mathrm{d_S})$ and $(V_2,\mathrm{d_S})$.

It is clear that the linear group $\mathrm{GL}(v,\mathbb{F}_q)$ acts on $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$ as a group of $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear isometries. If q is not prime then there are additional semilinear isometries arising from the Galois group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{F}_q) = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{F}_q/\mathbb{F}_p)$ in the obvious way (component-wise action on $\mathbb{F}_q^v$). Moreover, mapping a subspace $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^v$ ("linear code of length v over $\mathbb{F}_q$") to its dual code $X^\perp$ (with respect to the standard inner product) respects the subspace distance and hence yields a further automorphism π of the metric space $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$. The map π also represents a polarity (correlation of order 2) of the geometry $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$.

[7] For those already familiar with [15] we remark that our numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d)$ translate into Etzion's $\mathcal{A}_q^S(v,d)$.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that* $v \geq 3$.[8] *The automorphism group* G *of* $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$*, viewed as a metric space with respect to the subspace distance, is generated by* $\mathrm{GL}(v,\mathbb{F}_q)$, $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ *and* π*. More precisely,* G *is the semidirect product of the projective general semilinear group* $\mathrm{P\Gamma L}(v,\mathbb{F}_q)$ *with a group of order* 2 *acting by matrix transposition on* $\mathrm{PGL}(v,\mathbb{F}_q)$ *and trivially on* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{F}_q)$*.*

Most of this theorem is already contained in [45], but we include a complete proof for convenience.

Proof. Let f be an automorphism of $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$. Then either f interchanges $\{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ or leaves both subspaces invariant (using the fact that $\{\mathbf{0}\}$, $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ are the only subspaces with a unique complementary subspace). Moreover, if f fixes $\{\mathbf{0}\}$, $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ then it preserves the dimension of subspaces and hence represents a collineation of the geometry $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$. By the Fundamental Theorem of Projective Geometry (here we use the assumption $v \geq 3$), a collineation is represented by an element of $\mathrm{P\Gamma L}(v,\mathbb{F}_q)$. Since π interchanges $\{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $\mathbb{F}_q^v$, either f or $f\circ\pi$ stabilizes $\{\mathbf{0}\}$, $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ and belongs to $\mathrm{P\Gamma L}(v,\mathbb{F}_q)$. This proves the first assertion and shows that $\mathrm{P\Gamma L}(v,\mathbb{F}_q)$ has index 2 in G.[9] Finally, denoting by ϕ the Frobenius automorphism of $\mathbb{F}_q$ (over its prime field $\mathbb{F}_p$), we have $\phi(x_1y_1+\cdots+x_vy_v)=\phi(x_1)\phi(y_1)+\cdots+\phi(x_v)\phi(y_v)$ and hence, using a dimension argument, $\phi(X^\perp)=\phi(X)^\perp$, i.e. $\phi\circ\pi=\pi\circ\phi$. Since the adjoint map (with respect to the standard inner product on $\mathbb{F}_q^v$) of $\mathbf{x}\to\mathbf{Ax}$ is $\mathbf{y}\to\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{y}$, the second assertion follows and the proof is complete. □

In effect, Theorem 2.1 reduces the isomorphism problem for subspace codes to the determination of the orbits of $\mathrm{GL}(v,\mathbb{F}_q)$, respectively $\Gamma\mathrm{L}(v,\mathbb{F}_q)$, on subsets of $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$. In the most important case $q=2$ the semilinear part is void, which further simplifies the problem. As a word of caution we remark that, in view of the presence of the polarity π, the dimension distribution of subspace codes is not an isomorphism invariant. Rather we have that $\delta(\mathcal{C})=(\delta_0,\delta_1,\ldots,\delta_v)$ leaves for a code $\mathcal{C}'\cong\mathcal{C}$ the reverse distribution $\delta(\mathcal{C}')=(\delta_v,\delta_{v-1},\ldots,\delta_0)$ as a second possibility.

The formula in (5) for the Gaussian binomial coefficients, which can be put into the form

$$\begin{aligned}\begin{bmatrix} v \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q &= \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{v-1}(q^v-q^i)}{q^{k(v-k)}\cdot\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}(q^k-q^i)\cdot\prod_{i=0}^{v-k-1}(q^{v-k}-q^i)} \\ &= \frac{\#\,\mathrm{GL}(v,\mathbb{F}_q)}{q^{k(v-k)}\cdot\#\,\mathrm{GL}(k,\mathbb{F}_q)\cdot\#\,\mathrm{GL}(v-k,\mathbb{F}_q)},\end{aligned}$$

reflects the group-theoretical fact that $\mathrm{GL}(v,\mathbb{F}_q)$ acts on the set of k-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ transitively and with a stabilizer isomorphic to

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{GL}(k,\mathbb{F}_q) & * \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathrm{GL}(v-k,\mathbb{F}_q) \end{pmatrix}.$$

We can go further and ask for a description of the orbits of $\mathrm{GL}(v,\mathbb{F}_q)$ in its induced action on ordered pairs (X,Y) of subspaces. Such a description has significance for modeling the transmission of subspaces in the Koetter-Kschischang-Silva model by a discrete memoryless (stationary) channel, which in essence amounts to specifying time-independent transition probabilities $\mathrm{p}(Y|X)$.

[8] The case $v\leq 2$ is completely trivial—as far as subspace codes are concerned—and can be safely excluded.

[9] The nontrivial coset $\{\pi\circ g; g\in\mathrm{P\Gamma L}(v,\mathbb{F}_q)\}$ consists precisely of all correlations of $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$.

Lemma 2.2. *For any integer triple a, b, c satisfying $0 \le a, b \le v$ and $\max\{0, a+b-v\} \le c \le \min\{a, b\}$ the group $\mathrm{GL}(v, q)$ acts transitively on ordered pairs of subspaces (X, Y) of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ with $\dim(X) = a$, $\dim(Y) = b$, and $\dim(X \cap Y) = c$.[10] Moreover, each such integer triple gives rise to an orbit of $\mathrm{GL}(v, \mathbb{F}_q)$ on ordered pairs of subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ with length*

$$q^{(a-c)(b-c)} \begin{bmatrix} v \\ c \end{bmatrix}_q \begin{bmatrix} v-c \\ a-c \end{bmatrix}_q \begin{bmatrix} v-a \\ b-c \end{bmatrix}_q > 0.$$

Proof. The restrictions on a, b, c are obviously necessary, since $\dim(X \cap Y) \le \min\{\dim(X), \dim(Y)\}$ and $\dim(X \cap Y) = \dim(X) + \dim(Y) - \dim(X + Y) \ge \dim(X) + \dim(Y) - v$. Conversely, if a, b, c satisfy the restrictions then c, $a-c$, $b-c$ are non-negative with sum $c + (a-c) + (b-c) = a+b-c \le v$. Hence we can choose $a+b-c$ linearly independent vectors $\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{a+b-c}$ in $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ and set $X = \langle \mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_a \rangle$, $Y = \langle \mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_b \rangle$, and consequently $X \cap Y = \langle \mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_c \rangle$.

It remains to show that $\mathrm{GL}(v, q)$ acts transitively on those pairs of subspaces and compute the orbit lengths. Transitivity is an immediate consequence of the fact that the corresponding sequences of $a + b - c$ linearly independent vectors, defined as above, can be isomorphically mapped onto each other. The stabilizer of (X, Y) in $\mathrm{GL}(v, \mathbb{F}_q)$ has the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{GL}(c, \mathbb{F}_q) & * & * & * \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathrm{GL}(a-c, \mathbb{F}_q) & \mathbf{0} & * \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathrm{GL}(b-c, \mathbb{F}_q) & * \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathrm{GL}(v-a-b+c, \mathbb{F}_q) \end{pmatrix},$$

which leads to the stated formula for the orbit length after a short computation.[11] □

2.2. **Basic Properties of the Numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T)$.** In this subsection we collect some elementary but useful properties of the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T)$ and consider briefly the growth of $k \mapsto \mathrm{A}_q(v, d; k)$ (the constant-dimension case). Henceforth V will denote a v-dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{F}_q$, if not explicitly stated otherwise, and we will use the abbreviations $\begin{bmatrix} V \\ T \end{bmatrix}$ for the set of all subspaces $X \subseteq V$ with $\dim(X) \in T$ ($\begin{bmatrix} V \\ k \end{bmatrix}$ in the constant-dimension case $T = \{k\}$) and $\mathcal{C}_T = \mathcal{C} \cap \begin{bmatrix} V \\ T \end{bmatrix}$ for subspace codes $\mathcal{C}$ with ambient space V (with the usual convention $\mathcal{C}_k = \mathcal{C}_{\{k\}}$). Further we set $[a, b] = \{a, a+1, \ldots, b-1, b\}$ for $0 \le a \le b \le v$.

Note that the following properties apply in particular to $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d) = \mathrm{A}_q(v, d; [0, v])$.

Lemma 2.3. *(i) $\mathrm{A}_q(v, 1; T) = \sum_{t \in T} \begin{bmatrix} v \\ t \end{bmatrix}_q$, and the unique optimal code in this case is $\begin{bmatrix} V \\ T \end{bmatrix} = \biguplus_{t \in T} \begin{bmatrix} V \\ t \end{bmatrix}$;*

(ii) $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T) \ge \mathrm{A}_q(v, d'; T)$ for all $1 \le d \le d' \le v$;

(iii) $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T) \le \mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T')$ for all $T \subseteq T' \subseteq [0, v]$;

(iv) $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T \cup T') \le \mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T) + \mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T')$ for all $T, T' \subseteq [0, v]$; equality holds if $\min\{|t - t'|; t \in T, t' \in T'\}$ (i.e., the distance between T and T' in the Euclidean metric) is at least d;

(v) $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T) = \mathrm{A}_q(v, d; v - T)$, where $v - T = \{v - t; t \in T\}$.

[10] Alternatively, we could prescribe the dimension of the join $X + Y$ in place of $X \cap Y$.

[11] Alternatively, count quadruples (X, Y, Z, W) of subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ satisfying $X \cap Y = Z$, $X + Y = W$ and X/Z is complementary to Y/Z in W/Z.

(vi) *The metric space* $\begin{bmatrix} V \\ T \end{bmatrix}$, $T \neq \emptyset$, *has diameter* $v - d$, *where* $d = \min\{|s + t - v|; s, t \in T\}$ *(the distance between* v *and* $T+T \subset \mathbb{R}$ *in the Euclidean metric).*[12]

Proof. Only (iv), (v) and (vi) require a proof.

In (iv) we may assume $T \cap T' = \emptyset$. (Otherwise write $T \cup T' = T \uplus (T' \setminus T)$ and use (iii).) If $\mathcal{C}$ is any $(v, M, d; T \cup T')_q$ code then $\#\mathcal{C}_T \leq \mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T)$, $\#\mathcal{C}_{T'} \leq \mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T')$ and $M = \#\mathcal{C}_T + \#\mathcal{C}_{T'} \leq \mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T) + \mathrm{A}_q(v, d; T')$, as asserted.

For the proof of (v) assume $V = \mathbb{F}_q^v$ and use the fact that the map $\pi\colon X \to X^\perp$ represents an automorphism of the metric space $\mathrm{PG}(v-1, \mathbb{F}_q)$ and maps $\begin{bmatrix} V \\ T \end{bmatrix}$ onto $\begin{bmatrix} V \\ v-T \end{bmatrix}$.

Finally, (v) implies that the largest possible distance between $X \in \begin{bmatrix} V \\ s \end{bmatrix}$, $Y \in \begin{bmatrix} V \\ t \end{bmatrix}$ is $\min\{s + t, 2v - s - t\}$. (This is clearly true if $s + t \leq v$, and the case $s + t > v$ can be reduced to the former by setting $s' = v - s$, $t' = v - t$ and using (v).) In particular, the diameter of $\begin{bmatrix} V \\ s \end{bmatrix}$ is $2\min\{s, v - s\}$. Assertion (vi) now follows from the observation that $\min\{s + t, 2v - s - t\} = v - |s + t - v|$. □

Next we discuss the growth of the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; k)$ as a function of $k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, \lfloor v/2 \rfloor\}$.[13] While not directly applicable to the mixed-dimension case, this analysis provides some useful information also for this case, since mixed-dimension codes are composed of constant-dimension "layers".

Since the minimum distance of a a constant-dimension code is an even integer, we need only consider the case $d = 2\delta \in 2\mathbb{Z}$.

Lemma 2.4. *For* $1 \leq \delta \leq k \leq \lfloor v/2 \rfloor$ *the inequality*

$$\frac{\mathrm{A}_q(v, 2\delta; k)}{\mathrm{A}_q(v, 2\delta; k-1)} > q^{v-2k+\delta} \cdot C(q, \delta)$$

holds with $C(q, 1) = 1$ *and* $C(q, \delta) = 1 - 1/q$ *for* $\delta \geq 2$*; in particular,* $\mathrm{A}_q(v, 2\delta; k) > q \cdot \mathrm{A}_q(v, 2\delta; k-1)$. *As a consequence, the numbers* $\mathrm{A}_q(v, 2\delta; k)$, $k \in [\delta, v - \delta]$, *form a strictly unimodal sequence.*

Note that $C(q, \delta)$ is independent of v, k and satisfies $\lim_{q\to\infty} C(q, \delta) = 1$. In fact our proof of the lemma will show that for $\delta \geq 2$ the number $C(q, \delta) = 1 - q^{-1}$ may be replaced by the larger quantity $\prod_{i=\delta}^{\infty}(1 - q^{-i})$, which is even closer to 1.

Proof. First we consider the case $\delta = 1$, in which the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v, 2\delta; k) = \mathrm{A}_q(v, 2; k) = \begin{bmatrix} v \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q$ are already known. Here the assertion follows from

$$\frac{\begin{bmatrix} v \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q}{\begin{bmatrix} v \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix}_q} = \frac{q^{v-k+1} - 1}{q^k - 1} = q^{v-2k+1} \cdot \frac{1 - q^{-(v-k+1)}}{1 - q^{-k}} > q^{v-2k+1},$$

using $v - k + 1 > k$ for the last inequality.

Now assume $\delta \geq 2$. The lifting construction produces $(v, q^{(k-\delta+1)(v-k)}, 2\delta; k)_q$ constant-dimension codes ("lifted MRD codes") and gives the bound $\mathrm{A}_q(v, d; k) \geq q^{(k-\delta+1)(v-k)}$, which is enough for our present purpose. On the other hand, every $(v, M, 2\delta; k)_q$ code satisfies $\mathrm{d_S}(X, X') = 2k - 2\dim(X \cap X') \geq 2\delta$ or, equivalently, $\dim(X \cap X') \leq k - \delta$ for any two distinct codewords $X, X' \in \mathcal{C}$. This says that

[12] In particular, $\begin{bmatrix} V \\ T \end{bmatrix}$ has diameter v if there exist $s, t \in T$ with $s + t = v$ and diameter $< v$ otherwise.

[13] By symmetry, the range $k \in \{\lfloor v/2 \rfloor + 1, \ldots, v\}$ need not be considered; cf. Lemma 2.3(v).

$(k-\delta+1)$-dimensional subspaces of V are contained in at most one codeword of $\mathcal{C}$ and gives by double-counting the upper bound

$$M \le \frac{\begin{bmatrix} v \\ k-\delta+1 \end{bmatrix}_q}{\begin{bmatrix} k \\ k-\delta+1 \end{bmatrix}_q} = \frac{(q^v-1)(q^{v-1}-1)\cdots(q^{v-(k-\delta)}-1)}{(q^k-1)(q^{k-1}-1)\cdots(q^\delta-1)} \tag{6}$$

for such codes. Simplifying we get $M < q^{(k-\delta+1)(v-k)}/C(q,\delta,k)$ with $C(q,\delta,k) = \prod_{i=\delta}^{k}(1-q^{-i})$. Replacing k by $k-1$ turns this into an upper bound for $\mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta,k-1)$ and, together with the previously derived lower bound for $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d;k)$, gives the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta;k)}{\mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta;k-1)} &> \frac{q^{(k-\delta+1)(v-k)}\cdot C(q,\delta,k)}{q^{(k-\delta)(v-k+1)}} = q^{v-2k+\delta}\cdot C(q,\delta,k) \\ &> q^{v-2k+\delta}\cdot\prod_{i=\delta}^{\infty}(1-q^{-i}) = q^{v-2k+\delta}\cdot\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{\infty}(1-q^{-i})}{\prod_{i=1}^{\delta-1}(1-q^{-i})}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

From Euler's Pentagonal Number Theorem (see e.g. [46, Th. 15.5]) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^{\infty}(1-q^{-i}) &= 1+\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}(-1)^m\left(q^{-(3m^2-m)/2}+q^{-(3m^2+m)/2}\right) \\ &= 1-q^{-1}-q^{-2}+q^{-5}+q^{-7}-q^{-12}-q^{-15}\pm\cdots \\ &> 1-q^{-1}-q^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence (and using $\delta \ge 2$), the quotient in (7) is $> \frac{1-q^{-1}-q^{-2}}{1-q^{-1}} = \frac{q^2-q-1}{q^2-q} = 1-\frac{1}{q(q-1)} \ge 1-\frac{1}{q}$, as claimed. The remaining assertions of the lemma are clear. □

From the lemma, the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d;k)$ grow fast as a function of k in the range $0 \le k \le v/2$. This implies that the following simple estimates yield quite a good approximation to $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d)$.

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose that for some parameters q,v,d we already know all of the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d;k)$, $0 \le k \le v$. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{k=0 \\ k\equiv\lfloor v/2\rfloor \bmod d}}^{v} \mathrm{A}_q\big(v,2\lceil d/2\rceil;k\big) \le \mathrm{A}_q(v,d) \le 2+\sum_{k=\lceil d/2\rceil}^{v-\lceil d/2\rceil}\mathrm{A}_q\big(v,2\lceil d/2\rceil;k\big),$$

and this constitutes the best bound for $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d)$ that does not depend on information about the cross-distance distribution between different layers $\begin{bmatrix} V \\ k \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} V \\ l \end{bmatrix}$.

Proof. First note that 2δ, where $\delta = \lceil d/2\rceil$, is the smallest even integer $\ge d$ and hence $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d;k) = \mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta;k)$. Now the upper bound follows from the observation that the two (isomorphic) metric spaces consisting of all subspaces of V of dimension $< \delta$ (respectively, $> v-\delta$) have diameter $< d$ and thus contain at most one codeword of any $(v,M,d)_q$ code.

The lower bound follows from the inequality $\mathrm{d_S}(X,Y) \ge |\dim(X)-\dim(Y)|$ and remains valid if we replace $\lceil v/2\rceil$ by an arbitrary integer r. In order to show that the lower bound is maximized for $r = \lceil d/2\rceil$, let σ_r denote the sum of all numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta;k)$ with $k \in [0,v]$ and $k \equiv r \bmod d$. Since σ_r is d-periodic and satisfies $\sigma_r = \sigma_{v-r}$ for $0 \le r \le v$, it suffices to show $\sigma_r > \sigma_{r-1}$ for $\lceil (v-d)/2\rceil + 1 \le r \le \lfloor v/2\rfloor$.

For r in the indicated range, $\sigma_r - \sigma_{r-1}$ is a sum of terms of the form

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta;r{-}td){-}\mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta;r{-}1{-}td){+}\mathrm{A}_q\big(v,2\delta;r{+}(t{+}1)d\big){-}\mathrm{A}_q\big(v,2\delta;r{-}1{+}(t{+}1)d\big) =\\ &= \mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta;r{-}td){-}\mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta;r{-}1{-}td){-}\mathrm{A}_q\big(v,2\delta;v{-}r{+}1{-}(t{+}1)d\big){+}\mathrm{A}_q\big(v,2\delta;r{+}(t{+}1)d\big),\end{aligned}$$

where $0 \le t \le \lfloor r/d \rfloor$ and the convention $\mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta;k) = 0$ for $k \notin [0,v]$ has been used. From Lemma 2.4 we have

$$\mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta;r-td) \begin{cases} > q \cdot \mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta;r-1-td), \\ \ge q^{2r-v-1+d} \cdot \mathrm{A}_q\big(v,2\delta;v-r+1-(t+1)d\big), \end{cases}$$

and $2r - v - 1 + d \ge d - 1 \ge 1$.[14] From this (and $q \ge 2$) we can certainly conclude that $\mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta;r-td) > \mathrm{A}_q(v,2\delta;r-1-td) + \mathrm{A}_q\big(v,2\delta;v-r+1-(t+1)d\big)$, so that $\sigma_r - \sigma_{r-1}$ is positive, as claimed. □

2.3. **Shortening and Puncturing Subspace Codes.** In [36, 15] two different constructions of $(v-1, M', d')_q$ subspace codes from $(v, M, d)_q$ subspace codes were defined and both referred to as "puncturing subspace codes". Whereas the construction in [36] usually has $M' = M$ (as is the case for puncturing block codes), the construction in [15] satisfies $M' < M$ apart from trivial cases and behaves very much like the shortening construction for block codes. For this reason, we propose to change its name to "shortening subspace codes". We will now give a simple, coordinate-free definition of the shortening construction and generalize the puncturing construction of [36] to incorporate simultaneous point-hyperplane puncturing.

Definition 2.6. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a subspace code with ambient space V, H a hyperplane and P a point of $\mathrm{PG}(V)$. The *shortened codes* of $\mathcal{C}$ in H, P and the pair P, H are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}|_H &= \{X \in \mathcal{C}; X \subseteq H\},\\ \mathcal{C}|^P &= \{X/P; X \in \mathcal{C}, P \subseteq X\},\\ \mathcal{C}|_H^P &= \{X \in \mathcal{C}; X \subseteq H\} \cup \{Y \cap H; Y \in \mathcal{C}, P \subseteq Y\}\\ &= \mathcal{C}|_H \cup \{Y \cap H; Y \in \mathcal{C}|_P\}\end{aligned}$$

with ambient spaces H, V/P and H, respectively.

Note that the operations $\mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathcal{C}|^P$ and $\mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathcal{C}|_H$ are dual to each other in the sense that they are switched by the polarity π. Simultaneous point-hyperplane shortening $\mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathcal{C}|_H^P$ glues these parts together by means of the projection map $X \mapsto (X+P) \cap H$. The puncturing construction in [15] is equivalent to $\mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathcal{C}|_H^P$ with the additional assumption that P and H are not incident. This assumption implies $\mathcal{C}|^P \cap \mathcal{C}|_H = \emptyset$ and that $X \mapsto (X+P) \cap H$ maps $\mathcal{C}|^P$ isomorphically onto the subspace code $\{Y \cap H; Y \in \mathcal{C}|^P\}$.[15] Shortening in point-hyperplane pairs (P, H) with $P \subseteq H$ seems of little value and will not be considered further in this paper.

[14] Of course this implies that the second inequality above is also strict. The trivial case $d = 1$ has been tacitly excluded.

[15] Moreover, one can show that in this case $\mathcal{C}|_H^P \cong \{X + P; X \in \mathcal{C}|_H\} \cup \mathcal{C}|^P$, the analogous point-hyperplane shortening using $X \mapsto (X \cap H) + P$ instead.

Definition 2.7. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a subspace code with ambient space V, H a hyperplane and P a point of $\mathrm{PG}(V)$. The *punctured codes* of $\mathcal{C}$ in H, P are defined as

$$\mathcal{C}_H = \{X \cap H; X \in \mathcal{C}\},$$
$$\mathcal{C}^P = \big\{(X+P)/P; X \in \mathcal{C}\big\}$$

with ambient spaces H and V/P, respectively. Moreover, the punctured code of $\mathcal{C}$ in P, H with respect to a splitting $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1 \uplus \mathcal{C}_2$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{C}_H^P = (\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2)_H^P = \{X \cap H; X \in \mathcal{C}_1\} \cup \{(Y+P) \cap H; Y \in \mathcal{C}_2\}$$

with ambient space H.

Here mutatis mutandis the same remarks as on the shortening constructions apply. The original puncturing operation in [36] is $\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}_H$, with attention restricted to constant-dimension codes and the following modification: If $\mathcal{C}$ has constant-dimension k then $\mathcal{C}_H$ can be turned into a code of constant-dimension $k-1$ by replacing each subspace $X \in \mathcal{C}$ with $X \cap H = X$ (i.e. $X \subseteq H$) by some $(k-1)$-dimensional subspace contained in X. Simultaneous point-hyperplane puncturing has been defined to round off the construction principles and will not be used in later sections.

The next lemma provides general information about the parameters of shortened and punctured subspace codes. The lemma makes reference to the *degree* of a point P or a hyperplane H with respect to a subspace code $\mathcal{C}$, which are defined as $\deg(P) = \{X \in \mathcal{C}; P \subseteq X\} = \#\left(\mathcal{C}|^P\right)$ and dually as $\deg(H) = \{X \in \mathcal{C}; X \subseteq H\} = \#\left(\mathcal{C}|_H\right)$, respectively.[16]

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a $(v, M, d)_q$ subspace code with ambient space V and (P, H) a non-incident point-hyperplane pair in* $\mathrm{PG}(V)$.

(i) If $d \geq 2$ then the shortened code $\mathcal{C}|_H^P$ has parameters $(v-1, M', d')_q$ with $M' = \deg(P) + \deg(H)$ and $d' \geq d-1$.

(ii) If $d \geq 3$ then the punctured codes $\mathcal{C}_H$, $\mathcal{C}^P$ have parameters $(v-1, M, d')$ with $d' \geq d-2$. The same is true of the punctured code $(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2)_H^P$ with respect to any splitting $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1 \uplus \mathcal{C}_2$ satisfying $\mathrm{d_S}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2) \geq d+1$.

The strong bound $d' \geq d-1$ in Part (i) of the lemma accounts for the significance of the shortening construction, as mentioned in [15].

The usefulness of the bounds in Part (ii), which are weaker, is less clear. The first assertion in (ii) was already observed in [36] (for the code $\mathcal{C}_H$). The condition $\mathrm{d_S}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2) \geq d+1$ in the second assertion is required, since cross-distances can decrease by 3 during puncturing. Alternatively we could have assumed $d \geq 4$ and replaced $d' \geq d-2$ by $d' \geq d-3$ in the conclusion.

Proof of the lemma. (i) Since $P \not\subseteq H$, the codes $\mathcal{C}|_H$ and $\mathcal{C}|^P$ are disjoint, and since $d \geq 2$, the same is true of $\mathcal{C}|_H$ and $\{Y \cap H; Y \in \mathcal{C}|^P\}$. Hence we have $\#\mathcal{C}|_H^P = \#\left(\mathcal{C}|_H\right) + \#\left(\mathcal{C}|^P\right) = \deg(H) + \deg(P)$.

Since $Y \mapsto Y \cap H$ defines an isometry from $\mathrm{PG}(V/P)$ onto $\mathrm{PG}(H)$, we need only check "cross-distances" $\mathrm{d_S}(X, Y \cap H)$ with $X \in \mathcal{C}|_H$, $Y \in \mathcal{C}|^P$. In this case we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d_S}(X, Y \cap H) &= \dim(X) + \dim(Y \cap H) - 2\dim(X \cap Y \cap H)\\ &= \dim(X) + \dim(Y) - 1 - 2\dim(X \cap Y)\\ &= \mathrm{d_S}(X, Y) - 1,\end{aligned}$$

[16] Incidences with the trivial spaces $\{0\}$, V (if they are in $\mathcal{C}$) are thus not counted.

and the assertion regarding d' follows.

(ii) As in the proof of (i) one shows

$$\mathrm{d_S}(X+P,Y+P) \in \begin{cases} \{\mathrm{d_S}(X,Y), \mathrm{d_S}(X,Y)-2\} & \text{if } P \not\subseteq X \wedge P \not\subseteq Y \\ \{\mathrm{d_S}(X,Y)+1, \mathrm{d_S}(X,Y)-1\} & \text{if } P \not\subseteq X \wedge P \subseteq Y. \end{cases}$$

This implies the assertion about $\mathcal{C}^P$, and that about $\mathcal{C}_H$ follows by duality. For the last assertion we need only check cross-distances $\mathrm{d_S}\big(X\cap H, (Y+P)\cap H\big)$ with $X \in \mathcal{C}_1$, $Y \in \mathcal{C}_2$. As shown above, the numbers $\mathrm{d_S}(X,Y)$, $\mathrm{d_S}(X,Y+P)$, $\mathrm{d_S}\big(X,(Y+P)\cap H\big)$, $\mathrm{d_S}\big(X\cap H,(Y+P)\cap H\big)$ successively differ by at most one. Hence $\mathrm{d_S}\big(X\cap H,(Y+P)\cap H\big) \geq \mathrm{d_S}(X,Y)-3$, and the result follows.[17] □

2.4. **A Property of the Lifted Gabidulin Codes.** A q-ary lifted Gabidulin code $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{v,k,\delta}$ has parameters $(v, q^{(k-\delta+1)(v-k)}, 2\delta; k)$, where $1 \leq \delta \leq k \leq v/2$, and can be defined in a coordinate-free manner as follows (see e.g. [32, Sect. 2.5]): The ambient space is taken as $V = W \times \mathbb{F}_{q^n}$, where $n = v-k$ and W denotes a fixed k-dimensional $\mathbb{F}_q$-subspace of $\mathbb{F}_{q^n}$, and $\mathcal{G}$ consists of all subspaces

$$G(a_0,\ldots,a_{k-\delta}) = \big\{(x, a_0x + a_1x^q + a_2x^{q^2} + \cdots + a_{k-\delta}x^{q^{k-\delta}}); x \in W\big\}$$

with $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_{q^n}$. In other words, $\mathcal{G}$ consists of the graphs $\Gamma_f = \big\{(x,f(x)); x \in W\big\}$ of all $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear maps $f\colon W \to \mathbb{F}_{q^n}$ that are represented by a linearized polynomial of symbolic degree at most $k-\delta$.[18]

The code $\mathcal{G}$ forms a geometrically quite regular object. The most significant property, shared by all lifted MRD codes with the same parameters, is that $\mathcal{G}$ forms an exact 1-cover of the set of all $(k-\delta)$-flats of $\mathrm{PG}(V)$ that are disjoint from the special flat $S = \{0\} \times \mathbb{F}_{q^n}$.[19] A further regularity property, which we will need later, is that every point $P \notin S$ has degree $q^{(k-\delta)(v-k)}$ with respect to $\mathcal{G}$. Indeed, $P = \mathbb{F}_q(a,b) \in \Gamma_f$ if and only if $f(a) = b$ (using $a \neq 0$), which reduces f to a linear map on a $(k-1)$-dimensional subspace of W.[20]

From now on we assume that $n = k$ (or $v = 2k$, the "square" case) and hence $W = \mathbb{F}_{q^k}$. In this case the codes $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{2k,k,\delta}$, $1 \leq \delta \leq k$, are invariant under a correlation of $\mathrm{PG}(\mathbb{F}_{q^k} \times \mathbb{F}_{q^k})$ fixing S, as our next theorem shows. In particular, every hyperplane H of $\mathrm{PG}(V)$ with $H \not\supseteq S$ contains, dually so-to-speak, precisely $q^{(k-\delta)(v-k)}$ codewords of $\mathcal{G}$, This property will be needed later in Section 3.3. Before stating the theorem, let us remark that a non-degenerate bilinear form on $V = \mathbb{F}_{q^k} \times \mathbb{F}_{q^k}$ is given by $\big\langle (a,b),(x,y)\big\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(ax+by)$, where $\mathrm{Tr}(x) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}_{q^k}/\mathbb{F}_q}(x) = x + x^q + \cdots + x^{q^{k-1}}$ is the trace of the field extension $\mathbb{F}_{q^k}/\mathbb{F}_q$. The symbol $\perp$ will denote orthogonality with respect to this bilinear form. Hence hyperplanes of

[17] The distance actually drops by 3 in the case $P \subseteq X+Y \wedge X \cap (P+Y) \subseteq H$, and nontrivial examples of P, H, X, Y that satisfy these conditions are easily found.

[18] Recall that every $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear endomorphism of $\mathbb{F}_{q^n}$ is represented by a unique linearized polynomial of symbolic degree $\leq n-1$. Restriction to W then gives a canonical representation of $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear maps $f\colon W \to \mathbb{F}_{q^n}$ by linearized polynomials of symbolic degree $\leq k-1$.

[19] Since the codewords of $\mathcal{G}$ are disjoint from S (since they are graphs of linear maps), it is clear that only flats disjoint from S are covered. The exact cover property is a consequence of Delsarte's characterization of MRD codes (cf. Footnote 20) and is proved in [32, Lemma 6], for example.

[20] Here the following property of Gabidulin codes (or lifted MRD codes in general) due to Delsarte [10] simplifies the view considerably: Every $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear map $g\colon U \to \mathbb{F}_{q^n}$, defined on an arbitrary $(k-\delta+1)$-dimensional subspace U of W, extends uniquely to a linear map $f \in \mathcal{G}$. This property also gives $\#\mathcal{G}$ immediately.

$\mathrm{PG}(V)$ have the form $H_{a,b} = \big\{(x,y) \in V; \mathrm{Tr}(ax+by) = 0\big\} = \mathbb{F}_q(a,b)^\perp$ for a unique point $\mathbb{F}_q(a,b)$ of $\mathrm{PG}(V)$.

Theorem 2.9. *The q-ary Gabidulin codes $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{2k,k,\delta}$ are linearly isomorphic to their duals $\mathcal{G}^\perp = \{X^\perp; X \in \mathcal{G}\}$ and hence invariant under a correlation of $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$. Any correlation κ fixing $\mathcal{G}$ fixes also S.*

Proof. The condition $\mathbb{F}_q(a,b) \in G(a_0,\ldots,a_{k-\delta})^\perp$, or

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}\big(ax+bf(x)\big) &= \mathrm{Tr}\big((a+ba_0)x + ba_1x^q + \cdots + ba_{k-\delta}x^{q^{k-\delta}}\big)\\ &= \mathrm{Tr}\big((a+ba_0)^{q^{k-\delta}}x^{q^{k-\delta}} + (ba_1)^{q^{k-\delta-1}}x^{q^{k-\delta}} + \cdots + ba_{k-\delta}x^{q^{k-\delta}}\big)\\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^k}$, is equivalent to

$$a^{q^{k-\delta}} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-\delta}(-a_{k-\delta-i}^{q^i})b^{q^i},$$

since the trace bilinear form on $\mathbb{F}_{q^k}$ is non-degenerate. This shows

$$\mathbb{F}_q(a,b) \in G(a_0,\ldots,a_{k-\delta})^\perp \iff \mathbb{F}_q(b,a^{q^{k-\delta}}) \in G(-a_{k-\delta},-a_{k-\delta-1}^q,\ldots,-a_0^{q^{k-\delta}})$$

In other words, the $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear map $\phi\colon V \to V$, $(a,b) \mapsto (b,a^{q^{k-\delta}})$, which represents a collineation of $\mathrm{PG}(V)$, maps $G(a_0,\ldots,a_{k-\delta})^\perp$ to $G(-a_{k-\delta},-a_{k-\delta-1}^q,\ldots,-a_0^{q^{k-\delta}})$ and $\mathcal{G}^\perp = \big\{G(a_0,\ldots,a_{k-\delta})^\perp; a_i \in \mathbb{F}_{q^k}\big\}$ to $\mathcal{G}$. The correlation $\kappa\colon \mathbb{F}_q(a,b) \mapsto H_{b,a^{q^{k-\delta}}} = \mathbb{F}_q\phi(a,b)^\perp$ then satisfies $\kappa(\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{G}$, since $\mathrm{Tr}(ax+by) = \mathrm{Tr}(by + a^{q^{k-\delta}}x^{q^{k-\delta}})$ implies $\phi(H_{a,b}) = H_{b,a^{q^{k-\delta}}}$, i.e. ϕ and $\perp$ commute.[21]

The last assertion follows from the fact that S is the unique $(k-1)$-flat complementary to all codewords of $\mathcal{G}$. □

Remark 1. The automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ of $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{2k,k,\delta}$ obviously contains all collineations of $\mathrm{PG}(V)$, $V = \mathbb{F}_{q^k} \times \mathbb{F}_{q^k}$, induced by linear maps of the form $(x,y) \mapsto \big(ax, by + f(x)\big)$ with $a,b \in \mathbb{F}_{q^k}^\times$ and $f(x)$ as above. These collineations form a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$, which has two orbits on the point set $\mathcal{P}$ of $\mathrm{PG}(V)$, viz. S and $\mathcal{P} \setminus S$.[22] From this and Theorem 2.9 we have that for any point $P \notin S$ and any hyperplane $H \not\supseteq S$ there exists a correlation $\kappa \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ satisfying $\kappa(P) = H$.

2.5. **A Second-Order Bound for the Size of the Union of a Finite Set Family.** A recurring theme in subsequent sections of this paper will be the determination of the best lower bound for the size of a union $A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_\delta$ of a family of t-sets $A_1,\ldots,A_\delta$ with a prescribed upper bound s on the size of their pairwise intersections $A_i \cap A_j$, $1 \le i < j \le \delta$. For example, we may ask for the least number of points covered by δ k-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ at pairwise subspace distance $\ge 2k-2$, in which case $t = 1+q+\cdots+q^{k-1}$ and $s = 1$.[23]

Assuming that $A_1,\ldots,A_\delta \subseteq A$ for some "universal" set A, we define a_i as the number of "points" $a \in A$ contained in exactly i members of $A_1,\ldots,A_\delta$.

[21] This also shows that the square of κ is the collineation induced by $\phi^2\colon \mathbb{F}_q(a,b) \mapsto \mathbb{F}_q(a^q,b^q)$.

[22] Clearly this subgroup is also transitive on $\mathcal{G}$, but this fact won't be used in the sequel.

[23] It goes (well, almost) without saying that subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ are identified with the sets of points (1-dimensional subspaces) they contain.

Our assumptions and easy double-counting arguments give the following "standard equations/inequalities" for the first three binomial moments of the sequence $a_0, a_1, a_2, \ldots$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_0 &= \sum_{i\geq 0} a_i = \#A,\\ \mu_1 &= \sum_{i\geq 1} i a_i = \sum_{j=1}^{\delta} \#A_j = t\delta,\\ \mu_2 &= \sum_{i\geq 2} \binom{i}{2} a_i = \sum_{1\leq j_1<j_2\leq\delta} \#(A_{j_1}\cap A_{j_2}) \leq s\binom{\delta}{2}.\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

From this we infer that $\#(A_1\cup\cdots\cup A_\delta) = \sum_{i\geq 1} a_i \geq \mu_1 - \mu_2$ with equality if and only if $a_i = 0$ for $i \geq 4$. This is a special case of the classical second-order Bonferroni Inequality in Probability Theory [23].

Our setting usually permits $a_i > 0$ for fairly large i, so that we need a stronger bound. In the following proposition we state a bound suitable for our purposes. In essence this result is also known from Probability Theory [23]. We have adapted it to the present combinatorial setting and provide a self-contained proof, which may be of independent interest.

Lemma 2.10. *Suppose that $A_1, \ldots, A_\delta$ are finite nonempty sets with moments μ_1, μ_2 as defined in (8).*[24] *Then*

$$\#(A_1\cup\cdots\cup A_\delta) \quad \geq \frac{2(\mu_1 i_0 - \mu_2)}{i_0(i_0+1)} \quad \text{with } i_0 = 1 + \lfloor 2\mu_2/\mu_1 \rfloor.$$

Moreover, (2.10) remains valid if μ_1, μ_2 are replaced by any known bounds $\overline{\mu}_1 \leq \mu_1$ and $\overline{\mu}_2 \geq \mu_2$.

Proof. Using the representation $p(X) = p_0 + p_1 X + p_2 X(X-1)/2$, we can evaluate $\sum_{i\geq 0} p(i)a_i$ in terms of μ_0, μ_1, μ_2 for every polynomial $p(X) \in \mathbb{R}[X]$ of degree at most 2. If $p(0) > 0$ and $p(i) \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, this will give an upper bound for a_0 and hence a lower bound for $\#(A_1\cup\cdots\cup A_\delta) = \sum_{i\geq 1} a_i = \mu_0 - a_0$.[25] The polynomials

$$p(X) = \binom{X-i}{2} = \frac{1}{2}(X-i)(X-i-1) = \binom{X}{2} - i\binom{X}{1} + \frac{i(i+1)}{2}, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}^+,$$

have this property, since they are convex and vanish at two successive integers. We obtain

$$\frac{i(i+1)}{2} a_0 = p(0)a_0 \leq \sum_j p(j)a_j = \frac{i(i+1)}{2}\mu_0 - \mu_1 i + \mu_2 \quad (i \in \mathbb{Z}^+),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j\geq 1} a_j \geq \frac{2(\mu_1 i - \mu_2)}{i(i+1)} \quad (i \in \mathbb{Z}^+). \tag{9}$$

[24] The definition of μ_1, μ_2 does not depend on the choice of A.

[25] Exhibiting a quadratic polynomial $p(X)$ suitable for a particular problem in Combinatorics is sometimes referred to as the "variance trick"; cf. [7, p. 6].

The best (largest) of these bounds can be determined by applying standard calculus techniques to the function $f(x) = \frac{2(\mu_1 x - \mu_2)}{x(x+1)}$, $x > 0$. The function f satisfies

$$f\left(\frac{2\mu_2}{\mu_1}\right) = f\left(\frac{2\mu_2}{\mu_1} + 1\right) = \frac{\mu_1^2}{\mu_1 + 2\mu_2}$$

and $f(x) \leqslant f(x+1)$ for $x \leqslant 2\mu_2/\mu_1$. Hence the maximum value of f at integral arguments is obtained at $i_0 = \lfloor 2\mu_2/\mu_1 \rfloor + 1$.[26]

For a proof of the last assertion note that the family of bounds (9) also holds for $\overline{\mu}_1, \overline{\mu}_2$ in place of μ_1, μ_2. The rest of the proof is (mutatis mutandis) the same. □

3. Classification Results for General Parameter Sets

In this section we present old and new results on optimal subspace codes in the mixed-dimension case for general q, v, and d. We start with the largest possible minimum distances (i.e. $d \approx v$) and later switch to small d. Whenever possible, we determine the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d)$, the dimension distributions realized by the corresponding optimal codes, and a classification of the different isomorphism types. In order to avoid trivialities, we assume from now on $v \geq 3$ and $2 \leq d \leq v$.

3.1. Subspace Distance v.

Apart from the trivial case $d = 1$ covered already by Lemma 2.3(i), the case $d = v$ is the easiest to settle. For the statement of Part (ii) of the classification result recall that the largest size of a $(2k, M, 2k; k)_q$ constant-dimension code is $M = \mathrm{A}_q(2k, 2k; k) = q^k + 1$ and that optimal $(2k, q^k + 1, 2k; k)_q$ codes are the same as $(k-1)$-spreads in $\mathrm{PG}(2k-1, \mathbb{F}_q)$, i.e. sets of mutually disjoint $(k-1)$-flats (or k-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^{2k}$) partitioning the point set of $\mathrm{PG}(2k-1, \mathbb{F}_q)$. The number of isomorphism classes of such spreads or, equivalently, the number of equivalence classes of translation planes of order q^k with kernel containing $\mathbb{F}_q$ under the equivalence relation generated by isomorphism and transposition [11, 34], is generally unknown (and astronomically large even for modest parameter sizes).

Theorem 3.1. *(i) If v is odd then $\mathrm{A}_q(v,v) = 2$. There are $(v+1)/2$ isomorphism classes of optimal $(v,2,v)_q$ subspace codes. These have the form $\{X, X'\}$ with $\dim(X) = i \in [0, (v-1)/2]$, $\dim(X') = v - i$ and $X \cap X' = \{0\}$.*

(ii) If $v = 2k$ is even then $\mathrm{A}_q(v,v) = \mathrm{A}_q(v,v,k) = q^k + 1$. Every optimal $(v, q^k+1, v)_q$ subspace code has constant dimension k. The exact number of isomorphism classes of such codes is known in the following cases:

q	v	# *isomorphism classes*
2	4	1
2	6	1
2	8	7
3	4	2
3	6	7
4	4	3
5	4	20
7	4	973

The numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v,v)$ have also been determined in [22, Sect. 5].

[26] If $2\mu_2/\mu_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ then there are two optimal solutions, viz. $2\mu_2/\mu_1$ and $2\mu_2/\mu_1 + 1$. The (unique) maximum of f is at $x = \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}\left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}}\right) \in \left(\frac{2\mu_2}{\mu_1}, \frac{2\mu_2}{\mu_1} + 1\right)$.

Proof of the theorem. (i) Subspaces X, X' of V are at distance $\mathrm{d_S}(X, X') = v$ iff they are complementary ($X \cap X' = \{0\}$, $X + X' = V$). Since v is odd, subspaces of the same dimension cannot be complementary, excluding the existence of three mutually complementary subspaces. This implies $\mathrm{A}_q(v, v) = 2$. The classification of optimal $(v, 2, v)_q$ codes is then immediate.

(ii) Suppose that $\mathcal{C}$ is an arbitrary $(2k, M, 2k)_q$ code. If $\mathcal{C}$ contains a codeword of dimension $i \neq k$ then all other codewords must have dimension $2k - i \neq i$ and hence $\#\mathcal{C} \leq 2$. Certainly $\mathcal{C}$ cannot be optimal in this case. Hence $\mathcal{C}$ has constant dimension k and size $M = q^k + 1$.

Determining the isomorphism classes of the optimal $(2k, q^k + 1, 2k; k)_q$ codes in the table amounts to classifying the translation planes of order ≤ 49 up to isomorphism and polarity. This has been done in a series of papers [9, 12, 13, 26, 39], from which we have collected the relevant information; cf. also [41, Sect. 5]. [27] □

We remark that it is easy to obtain the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v, v; T)$ for arbitrary subsets $T \subseteq [0, v]$ from Theorem 3.1.

3.2. **Subspace Distance $v-1$.** The case $d = v-1$ is considerably more involved. Here we can no longer expect that optimal subspace codes have constant dimension, since for example in a $(2k, q^k + 1, 2k; k)_q$ constant-dimension code replacing any codeword by an incident $(k-1)$- or $(k+1)$-dimensional subspace produces a subspace code with $d = v-1$. However, it turns out that the largest constant-dimension codes satisfying $d \geq v - 1$ are still optimal among all $(v, M, v - 1)_q$ codes and that there are only few possibilities for the dimension distribution of an optimal $(v, M, v-1)_q$ code.

Before stating the classification result for $d = v-1$, let us recall that in the case of odd length $v = 2k+1$ the optimal constant-dimension codes in the two largest layers $\begin{bmatrix} V \\ k \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} V \\ k+1 \end{bmatrix}$ (which are isomorphic as metric spaces) correspond to maximal partial $(k-1)$-spreads in $\mathrm{PG}(2k, \mathbb{F}_q)$ and their duals.[28] The maximum size of a partial $(k-1)$-spread in $\mathrm{PG}(2k, \mathbb{F}_q)$ is $q^{k+1}+1$, as determined by Beutelspacher [4, Th. 4.1]; cf. also [14, Th. 2.7]. This gives $\mathrm{A}_q(2k+1, 2k; k)_q = \mathrm{A}_q(2k+1, 2k; k+1)_q = q^{k+1}+1$. Moreover, there are partial spreads $\mathcal{S}$ of the following type: The q^k holes (uncovered points) of $\mathcal{S}$ form the complement of a k-dimensional subspace X_0 in a $(k+1)$-dimensional subspace Y_0, and $X_0 \in \mathcal{S}$. We may call X_0 the "moving subspace" of $\mathcal{S}$, since it can replaced by any other k-dimensional subspace of Y_0 without destroying the spread property of $\mathcal{S}$.

Theorem 3.2. *(i) If $v = 2k$ is even then $\mathrm{A}_q(v, v-1) = \mathrm{A}_q(v, v; k) = q^k + 1$. All optimal subspace codes contain, apart from codewords of dimension k, at*

[27] Uniqueness of the projective planes of orders 4 and 8 gives the uniqueness of the $(4, 5, 4; 2)_2$ and $(6, 9, 6; 3)_2$ codes. The 8 translation planes of order 16 include 1 polar pair (the Lorimer-Rahilly and Johnson-Walker planes), accounting for 7 isomorphism classes of $(8, 17, 8; 4)_2$ codes. The 2 translation planes of order 9 ($\mathrm{PG}(2, \mathbb{F}_3)$ and the Hall plane) are both self-polar, accounting for 2 isomorphism classes of $(4, 10, 4; 2)_3$ codes. The 7 translation planes of order 27 are all self-polar, accounting for 7 isomorphism classes of $(6, 28, 6; 3)_3$ codes. Among the translation planes of order 16, three planes ($\mathrm{PG}(2, \mathbb{F}_{16})$, the Hall plane and one of the two semifield planes) have a kernel of order 4. All three planes are self-polar, accounting for 3 isomorphism classes of $(4, 17, 4; 2)_4$ codes. Finally, there are 21 translation planes of order 25 including 1 polar pair (the two Foulser planes) and 1347 translation planes of order 49 including 374 polar-pairs, accounting for the remaining two table entries.

[28] A partial spread is a set of mutually disjoint subspaces of the same dimension which does not necessarily cover the whole point set of the geometry.

most one codeword of each of the dimensions $k-1$ and $k+1$. The dimension distributions realized by optimal subspace codes are $(\delta_{k-1},\delta_k,\delta_{k+1}) = (0,q^k+1,0)$, $(1,q^k,0)$, $(0,q^k,1)$, $(1,q^k-1,1)$ (and $\delta_t = 0$ for all other t).

(ii) *If $v = 2k+1 \geq 5$ is odd then $\mathrm{A}_q(v,v-1) = \mathrm{A}_q(v,v-1;k) = q^{k+1}+1$. The dimension distributions realized by optimal subspace codes are $(\delta_{k-1},\delta_k,\delta_{k+1},\delta_{k+2}) = (0,q^{k+1}+1,0,0)$, $(0,0,q^{k+1}+1,0)$, $(0,q^{k+1},1,0)$, $(0,1,q^{k+1},0)$, $(0,q^{k+1},0,1)$, and $(1,0,q^{k+1},0)$.*

In (ii) it is necessary to exclude the case $v = 3$, since $\mathrm{A}_q(3,2) = q^2+q+2$; cf. Section 3.4. Some results on the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v,v-1)$ can also be found in [22, Sect. 5]

Proof. (i) Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an optimal $(2k,M,2k-1)_q$ code. Since $\begin{bmatrix} V \\ <k \end{bmatrix}$ has diameter $2k-2$, at most one codeword of dimension $< k$ can occur in $\mathcal{C}$, and similarly for dimension $> k$. This and Theorem 3.1(ii) give $q^k+1 \leq M \leq q^k+3$. Clearly there must be codewords of dimension k, and hence none of dimensions $< k-1$ or $> k+1$.

If there exists $X_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\dim(X_0) = k-1$ then $X_0 \cap Z = \emptyset$ for all other codewords $Z \in \mathcal{C}_k$. Similarly, if there exists $Y_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\dim(Y_0) = k+1$ then $Y_0 \cap Z = P$ is a point for all $Z \in \mathcal{C}_k$, and if both X_0 and Y_0 exist then they must be complementary subspaces of V.

If $\delta_k = q^k+1$ then $\mathcal{C}_k$ is a spread and covers all points. Hence X_0 cannot exist, i.e. $\delta_{k-1} = 0$. By duality we then have also $\delta_{k+1} = 0$ and hence $M = q^k+1$. Next suppose $\delta_k = q^k$. Then $\mathcal{C}_k$ is a partial spread with exactly $1+q+\cdots+q^{k-1}$ holes (uncovered points). If X_0 exists, it contains $1+q+\cdots+q^{k-2}$ of these holes. If Y_0 exists, it contains $\#Y_0 - q^k = 1+q+\cdots+q^{k-1}$ of these holes (i.e. all holes). Since these two properties conflict with each other, we must have $\delta_{k-1}\delta_{k+1} = 0$ and hence $M = q^k+1$. The only remaining possibility is $\delta_k = q^k-1$, $\delta_{k-1} = \delta_{k+1} = 1$; here $M = q^k+1$ as well.

Until now we have shown that $\mathrm{A}_q(v,v-1;k) = q^k+1$ and the dimension distributions realized by optimal codes are among those listed. Conversely, the distribution $(\delta_{k-1},\delta_k,\delta_{k+1}) = (0,q^k+1,0)$ is realized by a $(k-1)$-spread, $(1,q^k,0)$ by a $(k-1)$-spread with one subspace X replaced by a $(k-1)$-dimensional subspace $X_0 \subset X$, $(0,q^k,1)$ by the dual thereof, and $(1,q^k-1,1)$ by removing from a $(k-1)$-spread a pair of subspaces X,Y and adding X_0,Y_0 with $\dim(X_0) = k-1$, $\dim(Y_0) = k+1$, $X_0 \subset X$, $Y_0 \supset Y$ and $X_0 \cap Y_0 = \emptyset$.[29]

(ii) Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an optimal $(2k+1,M,2k)_q$ code. From the remarks preceding Theorem 3.2 we know that $M \geq q^{k+1}+1$. For reasons of diameter (cf. the proof of (i)[30]), $\mathcal{C}$ can contain only codewords of dimensions $k-1$, k, $k+1$ and $k+2$; moreover, $\delta_{k-1},\delta_{k+2} \leq 1$ and $\delta_{k-1}\delta_k = \delta_{k+1}\delta_{k+2} = 0$.

If $\delta_{k-1} = \delta_{k+2} = 1$ then $M = 2$, which is absurd.[31] If exactly one of $\delta_{k-1},\delta_{k+2}$ is nonzero, we can assume by duality that $\delta_{k+2} = 1$. The δ_k codewords in $\mathcal{C}_k$ form a partial spread and meet the single codeword $Y_0 \in \mathcal{C}_{k+2}$ in distinct points. Hence Y_0 contains $1+q+\cdots+q^{k+1}-\delta_k$ holes of $\mathcal{C}_k$ and $1+q+\cdots+q^{k+1}-\delta_k \leq 1+q+\cdots+q^{2k}-\delta_k(1+q+\cdots+q^{k-1})$, the total number of holes of $\mathcal{C}_k$. This implies $\delta_k \leq q^{k+1}$ and hence $M = q^{k+1}+1$, $(\delta_{k-1},\delta_k,\delta_{k+1},\delta_{k+2}) = (0,q^{k+1},0,1)$. A

[29] This can be done, since the (final) choice of Y_0 amounts to selecting a complement to $(X_0+Y)/Y$ in V/Y, i.e. a point outside a hyperplane in the quotient geometry $\mathrm{PG}(V/Y)$.

[30] The argument is almost the same: There must be codewords of dimension k or $k+1$ (otherwise $\#\mathcal{C} \leq 2$), and hence none of dimension $< k-1$ or $> k+2$

[31] We know already that $M \geq q^{k+1}+1$.

subspace code realizing this dimension distribution can be obtained from a maximal partial $(k-1)$-spread $\mathcal{S}$ of the type discussed before Theorem 3.2, if we replace the moving subspace X_0 by any $(k+2)$-dimensional subspace $Y \supset Y_0$.[32]

In the remaining case $\delta_{k-1} = \delta_{k+2} = 0$ we may assume $\delta_{k+1} \le \delta_k$, again by duality. Assuming further $\delta_{k+1} \in \{0,1\}$ or, by symmetry, $\delta_k \in \{q^{k+1}+1, q^{k+1}\}$ easily leads to $M = q^{k+1}+1$ and one of the dimension distributions $(0, q^{k+1}+1, 0, 0)$, $(0, q^{k+1}, 1, 0)$. The first distribution is realized by any maximal partial $(k-1)$-spread and the second distribution by a subspace code obtained from a maximal partial $(k-1)$-spread $\mathcal{S}$ of the type discussed before Theorem 3.2, if we replace the moving subspace X_0 by Y_0.

The only remaining case is $2 \le \delta_{k+1} \le \delta_k \le q^{k+1}-1$ (and $\delta_{k-1} = \delta_{k+2} = 0$). Here our goal is to show that this forces $\delta_k + \delta_{k+1} < q^{k+1}+1$, a contradiction. Since $M = \#\mathcal{C} > q^{k+1}+1$ implies the existence of a $(2k+1, q^{k+1}+1, 2k)_q$ code, we can assume $\delta_k = q^{k+1}+1-\delta_{k+1}$ and hence $2 \le \delta_{k+1} \le \lfloor (q^{k+1}+1)/2 \rfloor$.[33]

Let A, B be the sets of points covered by $\mathcal{C}_k$ and $\mathcal{C}_{k+1}$, respectively. Since codewords in $\mathcal{C}_k$ are mutually disjoint and disjoint from those in $\mathcal{C}_{k+1}$, we have $A \cap B = \emptyset$, $\#A = \delta_k(1+q+\cdots+q^{k-1}) = (q^{k+1}+1-\delta_{k+1})(1+q+\cdots+q^{k-1}) = 1+q+\cdots+q^{k-1}+q^{k+1}+\cdots+q^{2k}-\delta_{k+1}(1+q+\cdots+q^{k-1})$, and hence $\#B \le q^k + \delta_{k+1}(1+q+\cdots+q^{k-1})$. Further we know that codewords in $\mathcal{C}_{k+1}$ intersect each other in at most a point. Hence the desired contradiction will follow if we can show that the minimum number $c(\delta)$ of points covered by δ subspaces of V of dimension $k+1$ mutually intersecting in at most a point is strictly larger than than the linear function $g(\delta) = q^k + \delta(1+q+\cdots+q^{k-1})$ for all $\delta \in \{2,3,\ldots,q^{k+1}-1\}$.

For bounding $c(\delta)$ we use Lemma 2.10. The *degree distribution* $(b_0, b_1, b_2, \ldots)$ of such a set of subspaces is defined by $b_i = \#\{P; \deg(P) = i\}$ and satisfies the "standard equations"

$$\sum_{i\ge 0} b_i = 1+q+\cdots+q^{2k},$$
$$\sum_{i\ge 1} i b_i = \delta(1+q+\cdots+q^k),$$
$$\sum_{i\ge 2} \binom{i}{2} b_i = \binom{\delta}{2}.$$

In this case the moments $\mu_i = \mu_i(\delta)$, $i = 1,2$, and hence also the function $f(x) = f(x;\delta)$ used in the proof of Lemma 2.10, depend on δ. The lemma gives

$$c(\delta) = \sum_{i\ge 1} b_i \ge \frac{2\delta(1+q+\cdots+q^k)i_0 - \delta(\delta-1)}{i_0(i_0+1)}$$
$$= \frac{\delta\big(1+2i_0(1+q+\cdots+q^k)-\delta\big)}{i_0(i_0+1)} = f(i_0;\delta)$$

with $i_0 = i_0(\delta) = 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{\delta-1}{1+q+\cdots+q^k} \right\rfloor$, which is equivalent to

$$(i_0-1)(1+q+\cdots+q^k)+1 \le \delta \le i_0(1+q+\cdots+q^k). \tag{10}$$

[32] The remaining blocks $X \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfy $X \cap Y_0 = \emptyset$ and hence $\dim(X \cap Y) \le 1$.

[33] Using the smaller upper bound for δ_{k+1}, however, does not simplify the subsequent proof, and we may just consider the full range $2 \le \delta_{k+1} \le q^{k+1}-1$.

Since

$$\begin{aligned} f(i_0; i_0(1+q+\cdots+q^k)) &= f\big(i_0; 1+i_0(1+q+\cdots+q^k)\big) \\ &= f\big(i_0+1; 1+i_0(1+q+\cdots+q^k)\big), \end{aligned}$$

the latter equality being an instance of $f\big(\frac{2\mu_2}{\mu_1}\big) = f\big(\frac{2\mu_2}{\mu_1}+1\big)$ (cf. the proof of Lemma 2.10), we see that the lower bound $\delta \mapsto f\big(i_0(\delta);\delta\big)$ has a continuous extension $F\colon [1, q^{k+1}] \to \mathbb{R}$, which is strictly concave in the intervals displayed in (10) and constant on the "holes" of length 1 in between. From this it is clear that we need only check the inequality $F(\delta) > g(\delta)$ at the points $\delta = (i_0-1)(1+q+\cdots+q^k)+1$, $1 \le i_0 \le q$ (left endpoints of the intervals in (10)). Moreover, at the first endpoint $\delta = 1$ ($i_0 = 1$) and the last endpoint $\delta = q^{k+1}$ ($i_0 = q$) equality is sufficient.[34]

In the boundary cases we have indeed equality, $F(1) = f(1;1) = q^k + 1\cdot(1+q+\cdots+q^{k-1}) = g(1)$ and $F(q^{k+1}) = f(q;q^{k+1}) = q^k + q^{k+1}(1+q+\cdots+q^{k-1}) = g(q^{k+1})$, as is easily verified from the definition of $f(i_0;\delta)$.[35] Finally, for $2 \le i_0 \le q-1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} F\big(1+(i_0-1)(1+q+\cdots+q^k)\big) &= \frac{1}{i_0}(1+q+\cdots+q^k)\big(1+(i_0-1)(1+q+\cdots+q^k)\big) \\ &= (1+q+\cdots+q^k)\left(1+\tfrac{i_0-1}{i_0}\cdot(q+\cdots+q^k)\right) \\ &> (1+q+\cdots+q^k)\left(1+(i_0-1)(1+\cdots+q^{k-1})\right) \\ &= 1+\cdots+q^k+(i_0-1)(1+\cdots+q^k)(1+\cdots+q^{k-1}) \\ &= q^k+\big(1+(i_0-1)(1+\cdots+q^k)\big)(1+\cdots+q^{k-1}) \\ &= g\big(1+(i_0-1)(1+q+\cdots+q^k)\big), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\frac{i_0-1}{i_0}\cdot q > i_0-1$. This completes the proof of the theorem.[36] □

Remark 2. It is known that any partial $(k-1)$-spread in $\mathrm{PG}(2k-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$ of cardinality q^k-1 can be completed to a spread; see for example [14, Th. 4.5]. This implies that all optimal $(2k, q^k+1, 2k-1)_q$ subspace codes arise from a $(k-1)$-spread by the constructions described at the end of the proof of Part (i) of Theorem 3.2.

3.3. **Subspace Distance $v-2$.** The case $d = v-2$ is yet more involved and we are still far from being able to determine the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v, v-2)$ in general. For even $v = 2k$ the problem almost certainly includes the determination of the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(2k, 2k-2; k)$, which are known so far only in a single nontrivial case, viz. $\mathrm{A}_2(6,4;3) = 77$ [32]. On the other hand, we will present rather complete information on the odd case $v = 2k+1$, for which the corresponding numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(2k+1, 2k-1; k) = \mathrm{A}_q(2k+1, 2k; k) = q^{k+1}+1$, equal to the size of a maximal partial $(k-1)$-spread in $\mathrm{PG}(2k,\mathbb{F}_q)$, are known; cf. the references in Section 3.2. Our results are collected in Theorem 3.3 below. For the proof of the theorem we will need the fact that a maximal partial $(k-1)$-spread $\mathcal{S}$ in $\mathrm{PG}(2k,\mathbb{F}_q)$ covers each hyperplane at least once. This (well-known) fact may be seen as follows: If a

[34] The last point $\delta = q^{k+1}$ is best viewed as the right endpoint of the hole $[q^{k+1}-1, q^{k+1}]$, since the function $f(q;\delta)$ not really matters. Alternatively, one could check the strict inequality at $\delta = 2$ and $\delta = q^{k+1}-1$, respectively.

[35] This comes not unexpected, since in these cases the optimal codes have size $q^{k+1}+1$ and the sets A, B partition the point set of $\mathrm{PG}(2k,\mathbb{F}_q)$.

[36] The last computation could be replaced by another convexity argument involving the function $i_0 \mapsto f\big(i_0; 1+(i_0-1)(1+q+\cdots+q^k)\big)$.

hyperplane H of $\mathrm{PG}(2k,\mathbb{F}_q)$ contains t members of $\mathcal{S}$, it intersects the remaining $q^{k+1}+1-t$ members in a $(k-1)$-dimensional space and hence

$$t(1+q+\cdots+q^{k-1})+(q^{k+1}+1-t)(1+q+\cdots+q^{k-2}) \le \#H = 1+q+\cdots+q^{2k-1},$$

or $tq^{k-1} \le q^{k-1}+q^k$. The difference $q^{k-1}+q^k-tq^{k-1} = q^{k-1}(q+1-t)$ gives the number of holes of $\mathcal{S}$ in H, which must be $\le q^k$ (the total number of holes of $\mathcal{S}$). This implies $1 \le t \le q+1$, as asserted.

We also see that the number of holes of $\mathcal{S}$ in every hyperplane of $\mathrm{PG}(2k,\mathbb{F}_q)$ is of the form sq^{k-1} with $s \in \{0,1,\ldots,q\}$. Further, since the average number of members of $\mathcal{S}$ in a hyperplane is

$$\frac{(q^{k+1}+1)(1+q+\cdots+q^k)}{1+q+\cdots+q^{2k}} = \frac{1+q+\cdots+q^{2k+1}}{1+q+\cdots+q^{2k}} > q,$$

there exists at least one hyperplane containing $q+1$ members, and hence no holes of $\mathcal{S}$. The latter says that the set of holes of $\mathcal{S}$ does not form a blocking set with respect to hyperplanes and implies in particular that no line consists entirely of holes of $\mathcal{S}$. This fact will be needed later in Remark 4.

Theorem 3.3. *(i) If $v = 2k \ge 8$ is even then $\mathrm{A}_q(v,v-2) = \mathrm{A}_q(v,v-2;k)$, and the known bound $q^{2k}+1 \le \mathrm{A}_q(v,v-2;k) \le (q^k+1)^2$ applies. Moreover, $\mathrm{A}_q(4,2) = q^4+q^3+2q^2+q+3$ for all q, $\mathrm{A}_2(6,4) = 77$ and $q^6+2q^2+2q+1 \le \mathrm{A}_q(6,4) \le (q^3+1)^2$ for all $q \ge 3$.*

(ii) If $v = 2k+1 \ge 5$ is odd then $\mathrm{A}_q(v,v-2) \in \{2q^{k+1}+1, 2q^{k+1}+2\}$. Moreover, $\mathrm{A}_q(5,3) = 2q^3+2$ for all q and $\mathrm{A}_2(7,5) = 2\cdot 2^4+2 = 34$.[37]

Proof. (i) The evaluation of $\mathrm{A}_q(4,2)$ is a special case of Theorem 3.4 (but could also be easily accomplished ad hoc). From now on we assume $k \ge 3$.

In the constant-dimension case the bounds $q^{2k}+1 \le \mathrm{A}_q(v,v-2;k) \le (q^k+1)^2$ are well-known; see e.g. [32]. In order to show that the upper bound holds in the mixed-dimension case as well, let $\mathcal{C}$ be an optimal $(2k,M,2k-2)_q$ code and suppose $\mathcal{C}$ contains a codeword X_0 with $t = \dim(X_0) \ne k$. By duality we may assume $t \le k-1$, and we certainly have $t \ge k-2$, since otherwise $\mathcal{C}_{k-1} = \mathcal{C}_k = \emptyset$ and $\#\mathcal{C} \le 1+\mathrm{A}_q\big(2k,2k-2;[k+1,2k]\big) = 1+\mathrm{A}_q\big(2k,2k-2;[0,k-1]\big) = 1+\mathrm{A}_q(2k,2k-2;k-1) \le 1+\frac{q^{2k}-1}{q^{k-1}-1} \le q^{2k}$, contradicting the optimality of $\mathcal{C}$. The codewords in $\mathcal{C}_{k-2}\cup\mathcal{C}_{k-1} \ne \emptyset$ must be mutually disjoint and also disjoint from every codeword in $\mathcal{C}_k$. Moreover, $\delta_{k-2}\delta_{k-1} = 0$ and $\delta_{k-2} \le 1$.

Our strategy now is to bound the size of the "middle layer" $\#\mathcal{C}_k$ in terms of $t = \dim(X_0)$. If this leads to a sharp upper bound for $\mathcal{C}$, which conflicts with the best known lower bound for $\mathrm{A}_q(2k,2k-2;k)$, we can conclude $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_k$, and hence $\mathrm{A}_q(2k,2k-2) = \mathrm{A}_q(2k,2k-2;k)$.

Since any two codewords in $\mathcal{C}_k$ span at least a $(2k-1)$-dimensional space, we have that any $(2k-2)$-dimensional subspace of V contains at most one codeword of $\mathcal{C}_k$. Conversely, every codeword of $\mathcal{C}_k$, being disjoint from X_0, is contained in a $(2k-2)$-dimensional subspace intersecting X_0 in a subspace of the smallest possible dimension, viz. $\max\{t-2,0\}$.[38] Denoting by $\mathcal{S}$ the set of all such $(2k-2)$-dimensional subspaces and by r the (constant) degree of $\#\mathcal{C}_k$ with respect to $\mathcal{S}$, we

[37] The bounds for $\mathrm{A}_2(v,v-2)$ were already established in [15, Th. 5] and $\mathrm{A}_2(5,3) = 18$ in [18, Th. 14].

[38] The condition $\dim(S\cap X_0) = t-2$ is of course equivalent to $S+X_0 = V$, but we need the former for the counting argument.

get the bound $\#\mathcal{C}_k \le \#\mathcal{S}/r$. It is easily seen that

$$\#\mathcal{S} = \begin{bmatrix} t \\ t-2 \end{bmatrix}_q q^{2(2k-t)} = \begin{bmatrix} t \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q q^{4k-2t},$$
$$r = \begin{bmatrix} t \\ t-2 \end{bmatrix}_q q^{2(k-t)} = \begin{bmatrix} t \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q q^{2k-2t}$$

for $t \ge 2$ and hence $\#\mathcal{C}_k \le q^{2k}$ in this case.

For $t = 1$ (the case $t = 0$ does not occur on account of our assumption $k \ge 3$) we are in the case $k = 3$ and have instead $\#\mathcal{S} = (1+q+q^2+q^3+q^4)q^4$, $r = q^2+q$, yielding only the weaker bound $\#\mathcal{C}_3 \le \lfloor q^3(1+q+q^2+q^3+q^4)/(1+q)\rfloor = q^6+q^4+q^2-q$. However, this bound can be sharpened by using for $\mathcal{S}$ the set of hyperplanes H not incident with the point X_0 and the bound $\#(\mathcal{C}\cap H) \le q^3+1$. The improved bound is $\#\mathcal{C}_3 \le (q^3+1)\#\mathcal{S}/r = (q^3+1)q^5/q^2 = q^6+q^3$.

These bounds are sufficient to conclude the proof in the case where at most one codeword of dimension $\ne k$ exists. But for the case $\delta_{k-1} \ge 2$ and its dual, and for several cases having $\delta_{k-2}+\delta_{k-1} = \delta_{k+1}+\delta_{k+2} = 1$ we need better bounds.

First we do the case $\delta_{k-1} \ge 2$. Let X_1, X_2 be two distinct codewords in $\mathcal{C}_{k-1}$. Then X_1, X_2 are disjoint, and every $X \in \mathcal{C}_k$ is simultaneously disjoint from both X_1 and X_2. In this case we can bound $\#\mathcal{C}_k$ in the same way as above, using for $\mathcal{S}$ the set of $(2k-2)$-dimensional subspaces S of V satisfying $\dim(S\cap X_1) = \dim(S\cap X_2) = k-3$. Since the number of simultaneous complements of two disjoint lines in $\mathrm{PG}(n-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$ is $q^{2n-7}(q^2-1)(q-1)$,[39] we obtain

$$\#\mathcal{S} = \begin{bmatrix} k-1 \\ k-3 \end{bmatrix}_q^2 q^{2\cdot 6-7}(q^2-1)(q-1) = \begin{bmatrix} k-1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q^2 q^5(q^2-1)(q-1).$$

The degree r of $X \in \mathcal{C}_k$ with respect to $\mathcal{S}$ is equal to the number of $(k-2)$-dimensional subspaces of the k-dimensional space V/X meeting the (not necessarily distinct) hyperplanes $H_1 = (X_1+X)/X$ and $H_2 = (X_2+X)/X$ in a $(k-3)$-dimensional space. By duality, r is also equal to the number of lines in $\mathrm{PG}(k-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$ off two points P_1, P_2 (which may coincide or not), and hence

$$\begin{aligned} r &\ge \begin{bmatrix} k \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q - 2\begin{bmatrix} k-1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}_q + 1 = \begin{bmatrix} k-1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q q^2 - \left(\begin{bmatrix} k-1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}_q - 1\right) \\ &= \frac{(q^k-q)(q^{k-1}-q)}{(q^2-1)(q-1)} - \frac{q^{k-1}-q}{q-1} = \frac{(q^{k-1}-q)(q^k-q^2-q+1)}{(q^2-1)(q-1)}, \\ \#\mathcal{C}_k &\le \frac{q^4(q^{k-1}-1)^2(q^{k-2}-1)}{q^k-q^2-q+1} = \frac{q^{3k}-q^{2k+2}-2q^{2k+1}+2q^{k+3}+q^{k+2}-q^4}{q^k-q^2-q+1} \\ &\le q^{2k}-q^{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from a straightforward computation.[40] This new bound is sufficient for the range $2 \le \delta_{k-1} \le \frac{1}{2}q^{k+1}$ (since we may obviously assume $\delta_{k+1} \le \delta_{k-1}$), but there remains a gap to the known upper bound $\delta_{k-1} \le q^{k+1}+q^2$

[39] This is probably well-known and perhaps most easily established by counting triples (L_1, L_2, U) of mutually skew subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ with $\dim(L_1) = \dim(L_2) = 2$, $\dim(U) = n-2$ in two ways: Using canonical matrices, the number $\#\{(L_1,L_2,S)\} = \#\{(S,L_1,L_2)\}$ of such triples is easily found to be $\begin{bmatrix} n \\ n-2 \end{bmatrix}_q q^{2(n-2)}(q^{n-2}-1)(q^{n-2}-q)$. Dividing this number by $\#\{(L_1,L_2)\} = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q \begin{bmatrix} n-2 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q q^4$ gives $q^{2n-7}(q^2-1)(q-1)$, as asserted.

[40] The inequality is sharp precisely in the case $k = 3$, all q.

for $k \geq 4$, respectively, $\delta_2 \leq q^4+q^2+1$ for $k=3$. However, for $\delta_{k-1} > \frac{1}{2}q^{k+1}$ the standard method to bound $\#\mathcal{C}_k$ in terms of the point degrees can be used: Since the $\delta_{k-1}(1+q+\cdots+q^{k-2})$ points covered by the codewords in $\mathcal{C}_{k-1}$ must have degree 0 in $\mathcal{C}_k$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\#\mathcal{C}_k &\leq \frac{q^k+1}{q^k-1}\left(q^{2k}-1-\delta_{k-1}(q^{k-1}-1)\right) = (q^k+1)^2 - \delta_{k-1}\cdot\frac{(q^k+1)(q^{k-1}-1)}{q^k-1}\\ &< q^{2k}+1-\delta_{k-1}\left(\frac{(q^k+1)(q^{k-1}-1)}{q^k-1}-\frac{4}{q}\right).\end{aligned}$$

The factor of δ_{k-1} is ≥ 2 in all cases except $q=2$, $k=3$, leading to the desired contradiction $\#\mathcal{C} \leq \#\mathcal{C}_k + 2\delta_{k-1} \leq q^{2k}$. in the exceptional case we have $\#\mathcal{C} \leq 64+1+\frac{1}{7}\delta_{k-1} \leq 68$, which also does the job.

It remains to consider the cases with $\delta_{k-2}+\delta_{k-1} = \delta_{k+1}+\delta_{k+2} = 1$. We may assume $k \geq 4$ and need only improve the previously established bound $\#\mathcal{C}_k \leq q^{2k}$ by one. We denote the unique codewords of dimensions $t<k$ and $u>k$ by X_0 and Y_0, respectively. From the proof we have $\#\mathcal{C}_k = q^{2k}$ if and only if every $(2k-2)$-dimensional subspace of V meeting X_0 in a $t-2$-dimensional space contains a codeword of $\mathcal{C}_k$. Since $\dim(X_0\cap Y_0) = \frac{1}{2}\big(t+u-\mathrm{d_S}(X_0,Y_0)\big) \leq \big\lfloor\frac{1}{2}\big(k-1+k+2-(2k-2)\big)\big\rfloor = \lfloor\frac{3}{2}\rfloor = 1$, there exists a $(2k-2)$-dimensional subspace $S\subset V$ such that $\dim(S\cap X_0) = t-2$ and $\dim(S\cap Y_0) \geq u-1$. Then $\dim(S+Y_0)\leq 2k-1$ and hence $S+Y_0$, and a fortiori S, cannot contain a codeword of $\mathcal{C}_k$.[41] This gives $\#\mathcal{C}_k \leq q^{2k}-1$ and $\#\mathcal{C} \leq q^{2k}+1$, as desired.

Finally, the equality $\mathrm{A}_2(6,4) = \mathrm{A}_2(6,4;3) = 77$ follows from $\mathrm{A}_2(6,4;3) > 2^6+2^3$, which implies $\delta_i = 0$ for $i\in\{1,2,4,5\}$. The lower bound for $\mathrm{A}_q(6,4)$, $q\geq 3$ follows from the corresponding bound for $\mathrm{A}_q(6,4;3)$, established in [32, Th. 2].

(ii) First we show $\mathrm{A}_q(2k+1,2k-1) \geq 2q^{k+1}+1$. For this we take the q-ary lifted $(2k+2, q^{2(k+1)}, 2k; k+1)$ Gabidulin code $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{2k+2,k+1,k}$, which contains q^{k+1} codewords passing through any point P outside the special subspace $S = \{0\}\times\mathbb{F}_{q^{k+1}}$ and similarly q^{k+1} codewords in any hyperplane $H\not\subseteq S$; cf. Theorem 2.9. Among these points and hyperplanes we choose a non-incident pair (P,H) and shorten the code $\mathcal{G}$ in (P,H); cf. Section 2.3. The code $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{G}|_H^P \cup \{H\cap S\}$ then has the required parameters $(2k+1, 2k-1, 2q^{k+1}+1)$.[42] Let us remark here that $\mathcal{C}$ admits only extensions (without decreasing the minimum distance) by $(k+1)$-dimensional subspaces of $\mathrm{PG}(H)$ containing $S\cap H$ (which is k-dimensional) and by k-dimensional subspaces contained in the $(k+1)$-dimensional subspace $(S+P)\cap H$. Hence, if $k\geq 3$ then it is impossible to extend $\mathcal{C}$ by more than one subspace and improve the construction.[43]

Next we establish the upper bound $\mathrm{A}_q(2k+1,2k-1) \leq 2q^{k+1}+2$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an optimal $(2k+1, M, 2k-1)_q$ code. If $\mathcal{C}$ contains only codewords of dimensions k and $k+1$, the bound follows from $\mathrm{A}_q(2k+1,2k;k) = \mathrm{A}_q(2k+1,2k;k+1) = q^{k+1}+1$. Otherwise we must have $\delta_t = 0$ for $t\notin\{k-1,k,k+1,k+2\}$, since a codeword of dimension $t\leq k-2$ forces $\mathcal{C}_k = \emptyset$, contradicting $M\geq 2q^{k+1}+1$ (and likewise, using duality, for $t\geq k+3$). The remaining cases to consider are $(\delta_{k-1},\delta_{k+2}) = (1,0)$, $(0,1)$ or $(1,1)$. In these cases the bound is established using the remarks preceding

[41] Note that $X+Y_0 = V$ for every $X\in\mathcal{C}_k$, the dual of $X\cap X_0 = \{0\}$.

[42] The dimension distribution of $\mathcal{C}$ is $\delta_k = q^{k+1}+1$, $\delta_{k+1} = q^{k+1}$, and $\delta_t = 0$ otherwise. It is also possible to add a $(k+1$-dimensional space, either through P or in H, to $\mathcal{G}$ before shortening.

[43] For $k=2$ we can extend by a line in H meeting S in a point and a plane in H above S; cf. a subsequent part of the proof.

the theorem. For example, if $X \in \mathcal{C}_{k-1}$ exists then all $Y \in \mathcal{C}_{k+1}$ must be disjoint from X. Since the dual of a maximal partial $(k-1)$-spread in $\mathrm{PG}(2k, \mathbb{F}_q)$ necessarily covers every point, this excludes the possibility $\delta_{k+1} = q^{k+1} + 1$.

It remains to construct codes meeting the upper bound for $k = 2$, all q and for $k = 3$, $q = 2$.

First we consider the case $k = 2$. Using the shortening construction from Section 2.3, it suffices to exhibit a $(6, 2q^3 + 2, 6; 3)_q$ constant-dimension code consisting of $q^3 + 1$ planes through a point P and $q^3 + 1$ planes in a hyperplane H of $\mathrm{PG}(5, \mathbb{F}_q)$ with $P \notin H$. This can be accomplished by adding to the $(6, q^6, 4; 3)_q$ Gabidulin code two planes E, E' with $\mathrm{d_S}(E, E') = 4$ meeting the special plane $S = \{0\} \times \mathbb{F}_{q^3}$ in distinct lines $L \neq L'$, respectively, and choose for shortening a point $P \in E \setminus S$ and a hyperplane $H \supset E'$ with $H \cap S = L'$. Clearly P, H can be taken as non-incident, and then shortening the $(6, q^6 + 2, 4; 3)_q$ code $\mathcal{G} \cup \{E, E'\}$ in (P, H) yields the desired $(5, 2q^3 + 2, 3)_q$ code.[44]

In the case $k = 3$, $q = 2$ we found several $(7, 34, 5)_2$ codes by a computer search.[45] An example is the subspace code given by the row spaces of the matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&0&1&1\\ 0&1&0&1&1&1&1\\ 0&0&1&1&1&0&0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0&1&0&0&1&0&0\\ 0&0&1&0&0&1&0\\ 0&0&0&1&0&0&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&1&1&0&1\\ 0&1&0&0&0&1&1\\ 0&0&1&1&1&0&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0&0&0&0&1&0&0\\ 0&0&0&0&0&0&1\\ 0&0&0&0&0&0&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&1&1&1\\ 0&1&0&1&0&1&0\\ 0&0&1&1&1&1&1 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&0&0&0\\ 0&0&1&0&0&1&1\\ 0&0&0&1&0&1&0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&0&1&0\\ 0&1&0&1&0&0&1\\ 0&0&0&1&0&1&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&1&1&0\\ 0&1&0&1&1&0&0\\ 0&0&1&0&1&1&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&1&0&1\\ 0&1&1&0&0&0&1\\ 0&0&0&1&1&0&0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&1&0&0&1&0\\ 0&1&0&0&1&0&1\\ 0&0&0&1&1&1&0 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&1&0&0\\ 0&0&1&0&0&0&1\\ 0&0&0&1&0&1&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&1&1&1&0\\ 0&1&0&0&1&1&0\\ 0&0&1&0&1&0&0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&1&0&0&0\\ 0&1&0&0&1&1&1\\ 0&0&1&1&1&1&0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0&1&0&0&0&0&0\\ 0&0&1&0&0&0&0\\ 0&0&0&1&0&0&0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&1&0&1&1\\ 0&1&0&0&0&1&0\\ 0&0&1&0&1&1&0 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} 1&0&1&0&1&0&0\\ 0&1&0&0&0&0&1\\ 0&0&0&1&1&1&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&0&0&1\\ 0&1&1&0&1&1&1\\ 0&0&0&1&1&0&1 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&1&1&0\\ 0&1&0&0&1&0&0\\ 0&0&1&0&1&1&0\\ 0&0&0&1&1&1&0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0&1&0&0&0&1&0\\ 0&0&1&0&0&0&1\\ 0&0&0&1&0&1&0\\ 0&0&0&0&1&0&0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&0&1&1\\ 0&1&0&0&0&1&1\\ 0&0&0&1&0&1&0\\ 0&0&0&0&1&1&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&1&1&0\\ 0&1&0&0&0&0&0\\ 0&0&1&0&0&1&1\\ 0&0&0&1&1&0&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&0&0&0\\ 0&1&1&0&0&0&0\\ 0&0&0&1&0&0&1\\ 0&0&0&0&0&1&0 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&0&0&1\\ 0&1&0&0&1&0&1\\ 0&0&1&0&0&0&0\\ 0&0&0&1&0&1&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&0&1&1\\ 0&1&0&0&1&0&1\\ 0&0&1&0&1&0&1\\ 0&0&0&1&1&1&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&0&1&0\\ 0&1&0&1&0&0&0\\ 0&0&1&1&0&0&1\\ 0&0&0&0&1&0&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&1&0&1\\ 0&1&0&1&0&0&1\\ 0&0&1&0&0&0&1\\ 0&0&0&0&0&1&0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&1&0&0\\ 0&0&1&0&1&0&0\\ 0&0&0&1&0&0&0\\ 0&0&0&0&0&0&1 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&1&0&0&1\\ 0&1&0&1&0&1&0\\ 0&0&1&0&0&1&0\\ 0&0&0&0&1&1&0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&1&0&0&0&0\\ 0&1&1&0&1&0&0\\ 0&0&0&1&1&0&0\\ 0&0&0&0&0&1&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&1&0&1&0\\ 0&1&0&0&0&1&0\\ 0&0&1&1&0&0&0\\ 0&0&0&0&1&0&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&1&1&0&1\\ 0&1&0&1&1&0&0\\ 0&0&1&1&0&0&1\\ 0&0&0&0&0&1&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&1&0&0&0&1\\ 0&1&0&0&0&1&1\\ 0&0&0&1&0&0&0\\ 0&0&0&0&1&0&0 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&1&0&0&0\\ 0&1&0&0&0&0&1\\ 0&0&1&0&0&0&0\\ 0&0&0&0&1&1&1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&0&0&0\\ 0&1&0&0&0&0&0\\ 0&0&1&1&1&0&0\\ 0&0&0&0&0&0&1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The proof of Theorem 3.3 is now complete. □

Remark 3. It seems likely that $\mathrm{A}_q(v, v-2) = \mathrm{A}_q(v, v-2; k)$, $k = v/2$, holds for $v = 6$ as well.[46] From the proof of Part (i) it is clear that an optimal $(6, M, 4)_q$ code has $\delta_1 \leq 1$, $\delta_5 \leq 1$, $\delta_2 = \delta_4 = 0$, and hence $\mathrm{A}_q(6, 4) \leq \mathrm{A}_q(6, 4; 3) + 2$. The proof also shows that $\mathrm{A}_q(6, 4) > \mathrm{A}_q(6, 4; 3)$ requires $\mathrm{A}_q(6, 4; 3) \leq q^6 + q^3$, and hence $\mathrm{A}_q(6, 4) = \mathrm{A}_q(6, 4; 3)$ would follow from an improved lower bound on $\mathrm{A}_q(6, 4; 3)$.

In those cases where $\mathrm{A}_q(v, v-2) = \mathrm{A}_q(v, v-2; k)$ one may ask whether all optimal codes must have constant dimension. The parameter set $(v, d; k)_q = (8, 6; 4)_2$ illustrates the difficulties in answering this question: Presently it is only known that $257 \leq \mathrm{A}_2(8, 6) = \mathrm{A}_2(8, 6; 4) \leq 289$, with the corresponding Gabidulin code $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{8,4,3}$ of size 256 accounting for the lower bound. If the true value turns out to

[44] Another construction for $(5, 2q^3 + 2, 3)_q$ codes was recently found by Cossidente, Pavese and Storme [8].

[45] In fact, we succeeded in a complete classification of codes with these parameters. The total number of equivalence classes is 20. Details will be given in [33].

[46] For $q = 2$ this is known, as we stated in the theorem.

be 257 then there are both constant-dimension and mixed-dimension codes attaining the bound, since $\mathcal{G}$ can be extended by any at least 2-dimensional subspace of its special solid S; cf. Section 2.4.[47]

Remark 4. The dimension distributions realized by $(2k+1, 2q^{k+1}+2, 2k-1)_q$ codes, provided that codes with these parameters actually exist, can be completely determined.

In the case $k=2$ these are all four distributions that have "survived" the proof of Theorem 3.3(ii), viz. $(0,0,q^3{+}1,q^3{+}1,0,0)$, $(0,1,q^3{+}1,q^3,0,0)$, $(0,0,q^3,q^3{+}1,1,0)$ and $(0,1,q^3,q^3,1,0)$.[48] This can be seen as follows:

The shortening construction used in the proof yields a code $\mathcal{C}$ in $\mathrm{PG}(H)$ with $\delta_2=\delta_3=q^3+1$ and such that the layers $\mathcal{C}_2$ and $\mathcal{C}_3$ are (dual) partial spreads of the type discussed before Theorem 3.2. Let E_1, L_1 be the special plane (containing the holes) and the moving line of $\mathcal{C}_2$, and L_2, E_2 the special line (meet of the dual holes) and moving plane of $\mathcal{C}_3$. Then, using the notation in the proof of Theorem 3.3, $E_1=(S+P)\cap H$, $L_1=E\cap H$, $L_2=L'$, $E_2=E'$. In other words, L_1, L_2 meet in a point (the point $L\cap L'\in S$), $E_1=L_1+L_2$, and E_2 is some other plane through L_2. Replacing the plane $E_2\in\mathcal{C}$ by any point $Q\in L_2\setminus L_1$ minimum distance 3, since $Q\in E_1\setminus L_1$ is a hole of $\mathcal{C}_2$ and E_2 is the only plane in $\mathcal{C}_3$ containing Q,[49] and hence gives a $(5,2q^3+2,3)_q$ code with dimension distribution $(0,1,q^3+1,q^3,0,0)$. Similarly, replacing L_1 by any solid T containing E_1 but not E_2 produces a $(5,2q^3+2,3)_q$ code with dimension distribution $(0,0,q^3,q^3+1,1,0)$. Finally, since $\mathrm{d_S}(Q,T)=3$, the code $\{Q\}\cup(\mathcal{C}_2\setminus\{L_1\})\cup(\mathcal{C}_3\setminus\{E_2\})\cup\{T\}$ has parameters $(5,2q^3+2,3)_q$ as well and dimension distribution $(0,1,q^3,q^3,1,0)$.

For $k\geq 3$ the only possible dimension distribution is $\delta_k=\delta_{k+1}=q^{k+1}+1$. In order to see this, we may suppose by duality that $(\delta_{k-1},\delta_k,\delta_{k+1},\delta_{k+2})=(1,q^{k+1}+1,q^{k+1},0)$ or $(1,q^{k+1},q^{k+1},1)$ and must reduce this ad absurdum. In the first case, the codeword of dimension $k-1$ must be disjoint from the codewords in $\mathcal{C}_k$, which form a maximal partial spread in $\mathrm{PG}(2k,\mathbb{F}_q)$. This is impossible, since $k-1\geq 2$ but the set of holes of $\mathcal{C}_k$ cannot contain a line. In the second case, let $X\in\mathcal{C}_{k-1}$, $Y\in\mathcal{C}_{k+2}$ be the unique codewords of their respective dimensions, and note that the codewords in $\mathcal{C}_{k-1}\cup\mathcal{C}_k$ are mutually disjoint and meet Y in at most a point. Since $\delta_k=q^{k+1}$ is one less than the size of a maximal partial spread, $\mathcal{C}_k$ has $1+q+\cdots+q^k$ holes. The set of holes contains X and at least $\#Y-(q^{k+1}+1)=q+q^2+\cdots+q^k$ further points from Y. This gives the inequality

$$1+2(q^1+q^2+\cdots+q^{k-2})+q^{k-1}+q^k\leq 1+q+\cdots+q^k,$$

which is impossible for $k\geq 3$.

Question 1. *By our preceding considerations, any $(2k+1,2q^{k+1}+2,2k-1)_q$ code has the form $\mathcal{C}=\mathcal{S}_1\cup\mathcal{S}_2^\perp$, where $\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2$ are maximal partial $(k-1)$-spreads in $\mathrm{PG}(2k,\mathbb{F}_q)$. To construct a $(2k+1,2q^{k+1}+2,2k-1)_q$ code in this way, one has to pick $\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2$ in such a way that the intersection of any element of $\mathcal{S}_1$ with any element of $\mathcal{S}_2^\perp$ is at most a point. We refer to this as* doubling construction. *The natural question is: Which q and k admit a doubling construction?*

[47] Apart from such extensions, it is also possible to extend $\mathcal{G}$ by any 5- or 6-dimensional space containing S and by a solid meeting S in a plane. Extensions by more than one codeword are not possible (i.e. the minimum distance would necessarily be <6).

[48] Recall from the proof that $\delta_1=1$ forces $\delta_3\leq q^3$, and similarly for $\delta_4=1$.

[49] For the latter note that the points of degree 1 with respect to $\mathcal{C}_3$ are those on L_2, since they are contained in q^2 dual holes of $\mathcal{C}_3$.

Apart from $k = 2$, where a doubling construction is possible for every q, the only decided case is $(q, k) = (2, 3)$; cf. Theorem 3.3(ii). On the other hand, by the usual interpretation of $q = 1$ as the binary Hamming space, the case $q = 1$ corresponds to a $(2k + 1, 4, 2k - 1)$ binary block code. This code exists for $k \leq 2$, but it does not exist for $k \geq 3$. This might be a hint in the direction that the doubling construction is not possible for all combinations of $q \geq 2$ and k.

3.4. **Subspace distance 2.** The projective geometry $\mathrm{PG}(v-1, \mathbb{F}_q)$ or, in the vector space view, the set of $\mathbb{F}_q$-subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ under set inclusion, forms a finite modular geometric lattice. In particular $\mathrm{PG}(v-1, \mathbb{F}_q)$ is a ranked poset with rank function $X \mapsto \dim(X)$. The theory of finite posets can be used to determine the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v, 2)$ and the corresponding optimal codes, as outlined in [1]. The proof uses a result of Kleitman [35] on finite posets with the so-called LYM property, of which the geometries $\mathrm{PG}(v-1, \mathbb{F}_q)$ are particular examples. Partial results on the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v, 2)$ can also be found in [22, Sect. 4].

The classification of optimal $(v, M, 2)_q$ subspace codes is stated as Theorem 3.4 below. We will provide a self-contained proof of the theorem. The underlying idea is to use information on the intersection patterns of a $(v, M, 2)_q$ code with the various maximal chains of subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ for a bound on the code size M. Recall that a maximal chain in a poset is a totally ordered subset which is maximal with respect to set inclusion among all such subsets. The maximal chains in $\mathrm{PG}(v-1, \mathbb{F}_q)$ have the form $\mathcal{K} = \{X_0, X_1, \ldots, X_v\}$ with $\dim(X_i) = i$ and $X_i \subset X_{i+1}$.

If we assign to a subspace X as weight $w(X)$ the reciprocal of the number of maximal chains containing X, we can express the code size as

$$\#\mathcal{C} = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{C}} 1 = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{C}} w(X) \cdot \#\{\mathcal{K}; X \in \mathcal{K}\} = \sum_{\mathcal{K}} \left(\sum_{X \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{K}} w(X) \right).$$

Since $w(X) = n_i$ depends only on $i = \dim(X)$, the inner sums are all alike, and it turns out that they attain a simultaneous maximum at some subspace code, which then of course must be optimal. For other parameters the same method could in principle be applied using suitably chosen families of subsets of the lattice $\mathrm{PG}(v-1, \mathbb{F}_q)$, but it seems difficult to find families producing tight bounds.[50]

Theorem 3.4. *(i) If $v = 2k$ is even then*

$$\mathrm{A}_q(v, 2) = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq v \\ i \equiv k \bmod 2}} \begin{bmatrix} v \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q.$$

The unique (as a set of subspaces) optimal code in $\mathrm{PG}(v-1, \mathbb{F}_q)$ consists of all subspaces X of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ with $\dim(X) \equiv k \bmod 2$, and thus of all even-dimensional subspaces for $v \equiv 0 \bmod 4$ and of all odd-dimensional subspaces for $v \equiv 2 \bmod 4$.

(ii) $v = 2k + 1$ is odd then

$$\mathrm{A}_q(v, 2) = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq v \\ i \equiv 0 \bmod 2}} \begin{bmatrix} v \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq v \\ i \equiv 1 \bmod 2}} \begin{bmatrix} v \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q, \tag{11}$$

[50] Usually much is lost through the fact that no subspace code can maximize all inner sums simultaneously.

and there are precisely two distinct optimal codes in $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$*, containing all even-dimensional and all odd-dimensional subspaces of* $\mathbb{F}_q^v$*, respectively. Moreover these two codes are isomorphic.*

Proof. Since the collineation group of $\mathrm{PG}(v-1,\mathbb{F}_q)$ is transitive on subspaces of fixed dimension, the number n_i of maximal chains through a subspace X of dimension i does not depend on the choice of X. Further, since each maximal chain passes through a unique subspace of dimension i, we must have $n_i = n/\begin{bmatrix} v \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q$, where n denotes the total number of maximal chains. Hence (11) can be rewritten as

$$\#\mathcal{C} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\mathcal{K}=\{X_0,\dots,X_v\}} \left(\sum_{\substack{i\in\{0,\dots,v\} \\ X_i\in\mathcal{C}}} \begin{bmatrix} v \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q \right) \tag{12}$$

In order to maximize one of the inner sums in (12), the best we can do (remember the constraint $d \geq 2$) is to choose $\mathcal{C}$ such that either $\mathcal{C}\cap\mathcal{K} = \{X_0, X_2, X_4, \dots\}$ or $\mathcal{C}\cap\mathcal{K} = \{X_1, X_3, X_5, \dots\}$, depending on which of the sums $\sum_{i \text{ even}} \begin{bmatrix} v \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q$, $\sum_{i \text{ odd}} \begin{bmatrix} v \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q$ is larger.

For odd v both sums are equal, since $\begin{bmatrix} v \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q = \begin{bmatrix} v \\ v-i \end{bmatrix}_q$. Hence the inner sums are maximized by either choice, and for simultaneous maximization of all inner sums it is necessary and sufficient that the code $\mathcal{C}$ consists either of all even-dimensional subspaces or of all odd-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$.[51]

For even $v = 2k$ we use that the Gaussian binomial coefficients satisfy $\begin{bmatrix} v \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q > q\begin{bmatrix} v \\ i-1 \end{bmatrix}_q$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$; cf. the proof of Lemma 2.4. Together with symmetry this implies $\begin{bmatrix} v \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q > \begin{bmatrix} v \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix}_q + \begin{bmatrix} v \\ k+1 \end{bmatrix}_q$ and $\begin{bmatrix} v \\ k-2t \end{bmatrix}_q + \begin{bmatrix} v \\ k+2t \end{bmatrix}_q > \begin{bmatrix} v \\ k-2t-1 \end{bmatrix}_q + \begin{bmatrix} v \\ k+2t+1 \end{bmatrix}_q$ for $1 \leq t \leq (k-1)/2$. It follows that $\sum_{i\equiv k \bmod 2} \begin{bmatrix} v \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q > \sum_{i\equiv k+1 \bmod 2} \begin{bmatrix} v \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q$ and that the unique subspace code $\mathcal{C}$ simultaneously maximizing all inner sums in (12) consists of all subspaces X of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ with $\dim(X) \equiv k \bmod 2$. □

4. Bounds and Classification Results for Small Parameters

In this section we present the best currently known bounds for the numbers $\mathrm{A}_2(v,d)$, $v \leq 7$. In most of those cases, where the numbers $\mathrm{A}_2(v,d)$ are known, we also provide the classification of the optimal subspace codes.

Before turning attention to the binary case $q = 2$, let us remark that the results of Section 3 determine the numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d)$ for all q and $v \leq 5$; see Table 1. Regarding

$v\backslash d$	2	3	4	5
3	q^2+q+2	2		
4	$q^4+q^3+2q^2+q+3$	q^2+1	q^2+1	
5	$q^6+q^5+3q^4+3q^3+3q^2+2q+3$	$2q^3+2$	q^3+1	2

TABLE 1. The numbers $\mathrm{A}_q(v,d)$ for $v \leq 5$

the corresponding classification, we remark that for $(v,d) \in \{(3,2),(4,2),(5,2)\}$ the optimal codes are unique up to subspace code isomorphism (cf. Theorem 3.4); those

[51] Since $\{0\}$ and $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ belong to all maximal chains, the choice of $\mathcal{C}\cap\mathcal{K}$ for one chain determines all others.

for $(v,d) \in \{(3,3),(5,5)\}$ are classified by Theorem 3.1(i);[52] those for $(v,d)=(4,3)$ (and essentially for $(v,d)=(4,4)$ as well) have been classified for $q \le 7$ as part of the classification of translation planes of small order (cf. Theorems 3.1(ii) and 3.2(i)).

The remainder of this section is devoted exclusively to the case $q=2$. With a few notable exceptions, the numbers $\mathrm{A}_2(v,d)$ are known for $v \le 7$; see Table 2.

$v\backslash d$	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	8(1)	2(2)				
4	37(1)	5(3)	5(1)			
5	187(1)	18(24298)	9(7)	2(3)		
6	1521(1)	104–118	77(4)	9(4)	9(1)	
7	14606(1)	593–776	330–407	34(20)	17(928)	2(4)

TABLE 2. $\mathrm{A}_2(v,d)$ and isomorphism types of optimal codes for $v \le 7$

The exact values in the table come from Section 3. The number of isomorphism types of optimal $\big(v,\mathrm{A}_2(v,d),d\big)_2$ codes is given in parentheses. The remaining entries in the table will be derived in the rest of this section, except for the number of isomorphism types in the two cases $(v,d)=(7,5)$ and $(7,6)$, which will be derived in a subsequent paper [33].

Regarding the classification of the optimal codes corresponding to the exact values in the table, we have that the codes for $d=2$ are unique (Theorem 3.4) and those for $d=v \in \{3,5,7\}$ are classified into 2, 3 and 4 isomorphism types, respectively (Theorem 3.1(i)). The codes for $(v,d)=(4,4)$, $(6,6)$ are unique, since they correspond to the unique line spread in $\mathrm{PG}(3,\mathbb{F}_2)$, respectively, the unique plane spread in $\mathrm{PG}(5,\mathbb{F}_2)$; cf. Theorem 3.1(ii). For $(v,d)=(4,3)$ there are 3 different isomorphism types, represented by (i) a line spread $\mathcal{S}=\{L_1,L_2,L_3,L_4,L_5\}$, (ii) the lines L_1,L_2,L_3,L_4 and a point on L_5 and (iii) the lines L_1,L_2,L_3, a point $P \in L_4$ and a plane $E \supset L_5$ with $P \notin E$. For the proof of this assertion we use that by Theorem 3.2(i) the dimension distribution of an optimal $(4,5,3)_2$ code up to duality must be one of $(\delta_1,\delta_2,\delta_3)=(0,5,0)$, $(1,4,0)$, $(1,3,1)$ and that the corresponding codes form a single $\mathrm{GL}(4,\mathbb{F}_2)$-orbit. The latter has already been noted for the line spread and can be seen for the other two configurations as follows: The (element-wise) stabilizer in $\mathrm{GL}(4,\mathbb{F}_2)$ of 3 pairwise skew lines L_1,L_2,L_3, which may be taken as the row spaces of $\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1&0&0&0\\0&1&0&0\end{smallmatrix}\right)$, $\left(\begin{smallmatrix}0&0&1&0\\0&0&0&1\end{smallmatrix}\right)$, $\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1&0&1&0\\0&1&0&1\end{smallmatrix}\right)$, is conjugate to the subgroup formed by all block-diagonal matrices of the form $\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\mathbf{A}&\\&\mathbf{A}\end{smallmatrix}\right)$ with $\mathbf{A} \in \mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{F}_2)$. This subgroup acts regularly on the 6 points in $L_4 \cup L_5$, as is easily verified,[53] and leaves $\{L_4,L_5\}$ invariant.[54] Hence the stabilizer of L_1,L_2,L_3,L_4 (and L_5) acts transitively on L_5, showing uniqueness of the code with dimension distribution $(1,4,0)$. Moreover, the subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}(4,\mathbb{F}_2)$ fixing $\{L_1,L_2,L_3\}$ set-wise and the point P is isomorphic to S_3, and hence there exists $\mathbf{M} \in \mathrm{GL}(4,\mathbb{F}_2)$ interchanging L_1, L_2 and fixing L_3, P.[55]

[52] The different isomorphism types are represented by $\{\{0\},\mathbb{F}_q^3\}$ and a non-incident point-line pair in $\mathrm{PG}(2,\mathbb{F}_q)$, respectively, by $\{\{0\},\mathbb{F}_q^5\}$, a non-incident point-solid pair and a complementary line-plane pair in $\mathrm{PG}(4,\mathbb{F}_q)$.

[53] The 6 points have the form $\mathbb{F}_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ with $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$ nonzero and distinct, so that regularity follows from the doubly-transitive action of $\mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{F}_2)$ on $\mathbb{F}_2^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

[54] This follows from the fact that $L_4 \cup L_5$ is uniquely a union of two lines; in other words, the spread containing L_1,L_2,L_3 is uniquely determined.

[55] Using coordinates as above and writing $P=\mathbb{F}_2(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y})$, we have $\mathbf{M}=\left(\begin{smallmatrix}&\mathbf{A}\\\mathbf{A}&\end{smallmatrix}\right)$, where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{F}_2)$ is the "transposition" satisfying $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{y}$, $\mathbf{y}\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{x}$.

The matrix $\mathbf{M}$ cannot fix all three points on L_3 (otherwise it would fix all points in the plane $L_3 + P$ and hence also L_1, L_2). Since the three planes containing L_5 are transversal to L_3 and one of them (the plane containing P) is fixed by $\mathbf{M}$, the other two planes must be switched by $\mathbf{M}$. This shows that the code with dimension distribution $(1, 3, 1)$ is unique as well.

For $(v, d) = (6, 5)$ a similar argument shows that there are 4 isomorphism types of optimal codes, unique codes with dimension distribution $(\delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4) = (0, 9, 0)$, $(1, 8, 0)$ and two non-isomorphic codes with distribution $(1, 7, 1)$. Taking the ambient space as $\mathbb{F}_8 \times \mathbb{F}_8$, $\mathbb{F}_8 = \mathbb{F}_2[\alpha]$ with $\alpha^3 + \alpha + 1 = 0$, the latter two codes can be obtained from the partial plane spread $\{\mathbb{F}_8(1, y); y \in \mathbb{F}_8^\times\}$ by adding the line $\{0, \alpha, \alpha^2, \alpha^4\} \times \{0\}$ and either the solid $\mathbb{F}_2 \times \mathbb{F}_8$ or $\mathbb{F}_2\alpha^3 \times \mathbb{F}_8$.

The remaining cases, which are more complex, are described in separate subsections. Their analysis often required computer calculations. The computations for Section 4.1 were done in SageMath (`www.sagemath.org`). For isomorphism checks and the computation of automorphism groups, we used nauty [40] and the algorithm described in [20] (based on [19], see also [21]). To find subspace codes of maximum possible size, we used different approaches.

4.1. **The case $(v, d) = (7, 4)$.** This case is in a sense the most challenging, since its exact resolution will very likely encompass an answer to the existence question for a 2-analogue of the Fano plane.

Theorem 4.1. *We have* $330 \le \mathrm{A}_2(7, 4) \le 407$.

The lower bound is realized by adding the whole space $V = \mathbb{F}_2^7$ to the best currently known $(7, 329, 4; 3)_2$ constant-dimension code [5, 37, 31].[56] If a 2-analogue of the Fano plane exists, the same construction yields a $(7, 382, 4)_2$ code.

Let us remark that the previously best known upper bound was $\mathrm{A}_2(7, 4) \le 776$ [2]. The proof of the new upper bound will be divided into a series of lemmas. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a $(7, M, 4)_2$ subspace code with constant-dimension layers $(\mathcal{C}_0, \dots, \mathcal{C}_7)$ and dimension distribution $(\delta_0, \dots, \delta_7)$. By duality, we may assume w.l.o.g. that $\delta_3 \ge \delta_4$.

Lemma 4.2. *(i)* $\delta_4 \le 190$ *and* $\delta_3 \le f(\delta_4)$ *for the function* $f\colon \{0, 1, \dots, 190\} \to \mathbb{Z}$ *defined by* $f(0) = 381$ *and*

$$f(\delta) = \begin{cases} 381 - \left\lceil \frac{\delta(1+70i_0-\delta)}{7i_0(i_0+1)} \right\rceil & \text{if} \quad 35(i_0-1)+1 \le \delta \le 35i_0,\ 1 \le i_0 \le 4, \\ 381 - \delta & \text{if} \quad 141 \le \delta \le 190. \end{cases}$$

(ii) $\delta_3 + \delta_4 \le 381$*; equality can hold only in the constant-dimension case (i.e., for a 2-analogue of the Fano plane and its dual).*

Part (ii) of Lemma 4.2 will not be used in the sequel, but has been included since it seems interesting in its own right—showing $\mathrm{A}_2(7, 4; \{3, 4\}) \le 381$ and characterizing the corresponding extremal case.

Proof of the lemma. The codewords in $\mathcal{C}_3$ cover each line of $\mathrm{PG}(6, \mathbb{F}_2)$ at most once. Codewords in $\mathcal{C}_4$ may cover a line multiple times (up to 9 times, the size of a maximal partial spread in $\mathrm{PG}(4, \mathbb{F}_2)$), but at least they cannot cover the same line as a codeword in $\mathcal{C}_3$. Denoting by $c(\delta)$ the minimum number of lines covered by δ solids

[56] Note added in proof: Recently a $(7, 333, 4; 3)_2$ constant-dimension code has been found [27]. This improves the lower bound for $\mathrm{A}_2(7, 4)$ to 334.

$S_1, \ldots, S_\delta$ in $\mathrm{PG}(6, \mathbb{F}_2)$ at mutual distance ≥ 4, we have the bound $7\delta_3 + c(\delta_4) \leq 7 \cdot 381 = 2667$, the total number of lines in $\mathrm{PG}(6, \mathbb{F}_2)$. Thus $\delta_3 \leq 381 - \lceil c(\delta_4)/7 \rceil$, and any lower bound on $c(\delta)$ will yield a corresponding upper bound for δ_3.

For lower-bounding $c(\delta)$ we use Lemma 2.10. If b_i is the number of lines contained in exactly i solids then

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} b_i = 2667,$$
$$\sum_{i \geq 1} i b_i = 35\delta,$$
$$\sum_{i \geq 2} \binom{i}{2} b_i = e \leq \binom{\delta}{2},$$

where e denotes the number of edges of the distance-4 graph of $\{S_1, \ldots, S_\delta\}$. Since the degree of S_i in the distance-4 graph is at most $7 \cdot (21 - 1) = 140$,[57] a reasonable upper bound for the second binomial moment of $b_0, b_1, b_2, \ldots$ is

$$\overline{\mu}_2 = \begin{cases} \delta(\delta - 1)/2 & \text{if } \delta \leq 140, \\ 70\delta & \text{if } \delta \geq 141. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.10 gives

$$c(\delta) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{\delta(1+70i_0-\delta)}{i_0(i_0+1)} & \text{if } \quad 35(i_0-1)+1 \leq \delta \leq 35i_0,\ 1 \leq i_0 \leq 4, \\ 7\delta & \text{if } \quad \delta \geq 141. \end{cases}$$

Together with the bound $\delta_3 \leq 381 - \lceil c(\delta_4)/7 \rceil$ this proves Part (i).

Moreover, since $f(\delta) < 381 - \delta$ for $\delta \leq 140$ (as is easily verified), we have the bound $\delta_3 + \delta_4 \leq 381$; equality is possible only if $141 \leq \delta_4 \leq 190$ and the distance-4 graph on $\mathcal{C}_4 = \{S_1, \ldots, S_{\delta_4}\}$ is regular of degree 140.[58] But this is absurd, since in the dual (plane) view every point of $\mathrm{PG}(6, \mathbb{F}_2)$ would be covered by a plane and hence by exactly 21 planes (implying $\delta_4 = 381$). This proves Part (ii). □

For the next lemma recall that the size of a maximal partial line spread in $\mathrm{PG}(6, \mathbb{F}_2)$ is 41 (leaving $127 - 3 \cdot 41 = 4 = q^2$ holes, the smallest number one can achieve for odd v; cf. [4, 14]). This implies $\delta_2 \leq 41$ (and, by duality, also $\delta_5 \leq 41$).

Lemma 4.3. *$\delta_3 \leq g(\delta_2)$, where $g\colon \{0, 1, \ldots, 41\} \to \mathbb{Z}$ takes the following values:*

δ	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
$g(\delta)$	381	354	328	304	281	260	240	221	203	186	171	157	145	134	124	115	107	101

δ	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41
$g(\delta)$	96	93	91	90	87	77	70	61	56	48	43	25	17	12	9	8	5	4	3	2	2	1	1	0

Proof of the lemma. The δ_2 codewords in $\mathcal{C}_2$ form a partial line spread in $\mathrm{PG}(6, \mathbb{F}_2)$. No plane $E \in \mathcal{C}_3$ can meet any line $L \in \mathcal{C}_2$, since this would result in $\mathrm{d_S}(L, E) \in \{1, 3\}$. Hence, if $g(\delta)$ denotes an upper bound for the number of planes at pairwise subspace distance ≥ 4 and disjoint from any set $L_1, \ldots, L_\delta$ of δ pairwise disjoint lines, we get the bound $\delta_3 \leq g(\delta_2)$.

We have found three such bounds. Each of them turns out to be stronger than the other two in a certain subinterval of $\{0, 1, \ldots, 41\}$; cf. the subsequent Remark 5.

[57] The bound is the same as for the distance-4 graph of a set of planes at mutual distance ≥ 4.

[58] Going backwards, $\delta_3 + \delta_4 = 381$ implies $c(\delta_4) = 7\delta_4$ and $e = 70\delta_4$.

The first bound $g_1(\delta)$ is derived from the observation that no line of $\mathrm{PG}(6,\mathbb{F}_2)$ that meets some line L_i can be covered by a plane in $\mathcal{C}_3$. Hence, denoting by $m(\delta)$ any lower bound for the number of such lines, we can set $g_1(\delta) = 381 - \lceil m(\delta)/7 \rceil$.

A good lower bound $m(\delta)$ is obtained as follows. The δ lines cover 3δ points. Denoting by b_i the number of lines in $\mathrm{PG}(6,\mathbb{F}_2)$ containing exactly i of these points, we have

$$\begin{aligned} b_0 \;+\; b_1 \;+\; b_2 \;+\; b_3 &= 2667, \\ b_1 \;+\; 2b_2 \;+\; 3b_3 &= 3\delta \cdot 63 = 189\delta, \\ b_2 \;+\; 3b_3 &= \tbinom{3\delta}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $b_1+b_2 = 189\delta - \binom{3\delta}{2} = 186\delta - 9\binom{\delta}{2}$ and $b_1+b_2+b_3 \geq b_1+b_2+\delta = 187\delta - 9\binom{\delta}{2}$, so that we may take $m(\delta) = 187\delta - 9\binom{\delta}{2} = \delta(383-9\delta)/2$. This gives the first upper bound

$$g_1(\delta) = 381 - \left\lceil \frac{\delta(383-9\delta)}{14} \right\rceil .$$ [59]

For the second bound we estimate the number b_0 of lines disjoint from $L_1 \cup \cdots \cup L_\delta$ directly. For this we denote the complementary point set by T and write $t = \#T = 127 - 3\delta$. Since any point of T is on at most $\lfloor (t-1)/2 \rfloor$ lines that are contained in T, we have $b_0 \leq (t/3)\lfloor (t-1)/2 \rfloor$. Since planes in $\mathcal{C}_3$ can cover only lines contained in T, we obtain our second upper bound

$$g_2(\delta) = \left\lfloor \frac{t\lfloor (t-1)/2 \rfloor}{21} \right\rfloor , \quad t = 127 - 3\delta.$$

For the third bound we estimate the number $c(\delta')$ of points covered by δ' planes at pairwise subspace distance ≥ 4 with the aid of Lemma 2.10. The relevant moments/moment bounds are $\mu_1 = 7\delta'$, $\overline{\mu}_2 = \delta'(\delta'-1)/2$, resulting in

$$c(\delta') \geq \frac{\delta'(14i_0 + 1 - \delta')}{i_0(i_0+1)} \quad \text{for } 7(i_0-1)+1 \leq \delta' \leq 7i_0.$$

This leads to our third upper bound

$$g_3(\delta) = \max\bigl\{\delta'; c(\delta') \leq 127 - 3\delta\bigr\}.$$

The combination of the three bounds, viz. $g(\delta) = \min\bigl\{g_1(\delta), g_2(\delta), g_3(\delta)\bigr\}$ for $\delta \in \{0,1,\ldots,41\}$, takes exactly the values shown in the table. □

Remark 5. All three individual bounds are needed for the optimal bound $g(\delta)$. In fact, $g(\delta)$ coincides with $g_1(\delta)$ in the range $1 \leq \delta \leq 21$, with $g_2(\delta)$ in the ranges $22 \leq \delta \leq 28$, $39 \leq \delta \leq 41$, and with $g_3(\delta)$ in the range $28 \leq \delta \leq 41$.[60]

Lemma 4.4. *$\delta_3 \leq h(\delta_5)$, where $h\colon \{0,1,\ldots,41\} \to \mathbb{Z}$ is the (unique) non-increasing function taking the values*

δ	0	1	2	3	5	9	18	33	37	41
$h(\delta)$	381	376	372	371	370	369	368	367	366	365

and jumps (i.e., $h(\delta) > h(\delta+1)$) precisely at the corresponding arguments.[61]

[59] The quadratic $\delta(383-9\delta)$ is decreasing for $\delta \geq \frac{383}{18} \approx 21$, rendering this bound trivial for large values of δ.

[60] Furthermore, all bounds take the "trivial" value 381 at $\delta = 0$

[61] except for $\delta = 41$, of course

Proof. First we consider a 4-flat $U \in \mathcal{C}_5$ and denote by $a_i = a_i(U)$ the number of planes $E \in \mathcal{C}_3$ intersecting U in a subspace of dimension i, $1 \le i \le 3$. Since $\mathrm{d_S}(E,U) \ge 4$, we must have $a_3 = 0$, and a_1, a_2 are subject to the following restrictions:

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 + a_2 &= \delta_3, \\ 4a_1 &\le 1024, \\ 3a_1 + 6a_2 &\le 1488, \\ a_2 &\le 155. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

This follows from counting the lines L with $\dim(L \cap U) = i \in \{0,1,2\}$ covered by $\mathcal{C}_3$ in two ways, observing that the number of such lines cannot exceed 2^{10} for $i = 0$, $(63-15)\cdot 31 = 1488$ for $i = 1$, and $\begin{bmatrix} 5 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_2 = 155$ for $i = 2$.

Viewed as a maximization problem for δ_3, (13) has the unique optimal solution $a_1^* = 256$, $a_2^* = 120$ with objective value $\delta_3^* = 376$. This accounts for $h(1) = 376$ in the table. If a plane subspace code with these parameters actually exists, it must leave exactly 35 lines in U uncovered (and cover all lines not contained in U).

Since the 4-flats in $\mathcal{C}_5$ form a dual partial line spread, any two of them intersect in a plane and have at most 7 lines in common. This implies that for $\delta_5 > 1$ it is impossible to leave simultaneously exactly 35 lines uncovered in each 4-flat in $\mathcal{C}_5$, and enables us to derive subsequently a stronger bound for δ_3.

It is easily checked that a feasible solution of (13) with $a_2 = 155 - t$ must have $\delta_3 \le 341 + t$. For any $t \in \{0, 1, \ldots, 35\}$ either at least t lines remain uncovered in each of the δ_5 4-flats in $\mathcal{C}_5$ or the bound $\delta_3 \le h_1(t) = 340 + t$ holds. In the first case we will use a lower bound $c(\delta, t)$ for the union of δ line sets of size t pairwise intersecting in at most 7 lines (with a slight modification for large δ, see below) to get the bound $\delta_3 \le h_2(\delta_5, t)$ with $h_2(\delta, t) = 381 - \lceil c(\delta,t)/7 \rceil$. Putting the two bounds together and minimizing over t gives the final bound $\delta_3 \le h(\delta_5)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} h(\delta) &= \min_{0 \le t \le 35} \max\bigl\{h_1(t), h_2(\delta,t)\bigr\} \\ &= 381 - \max_{0 \le t \le 35} \min\bigl\{41 - t, \lceil c(\delta,t)/7 \rceil\bigr\}. \end{aligned}$$

A suitable bound $c(\delta, t)$ can again be obtained with the aid of Lemma 2.10. Suppose $U_1, \ldots, U_\delta$ are 4-flats in $\mathrm{PG}(6, \mathbb{F}_2)$ pairwise intersecting in a plane and $\mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_\delta$ line sets with $\#\mathcal{L}_j = t$ and $L \subset U_j$ for $L \in \mathcal{L}_j$. Denote by b_i the number of lines of $\mathrm{PG}(6, \mathbb{F}_2)$ contained in exactly i of the line sets. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \ge 0} b_i &= 2667, \\ \sum_{i \ge 1} i b_i &= t\delta, \\ \sum_{i \ge 2} \binom{i}{2} b_i &\le \overline{\mu}_2 = 7\binom{\delta}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 2.10 gives the lower bound

$$\#(\mathcal{L}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{L}_\delta) \ge c(\delta, t) = \frac{\delta(2ti_0 + 7 - 7\delta)}{i_0(i_0+1)} \quad \text{with} \quad i_0 = 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{7(\delta-1)}{t} \right\rfloor.$$

A different lower bound,

$$\#(\mathcal{L}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{L}_\delta) \ge \left\lceil \frac{t\delta}{9} \right\rceil,$$

is obtained from the observation that every line $L \in \mathcal{L}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{L}_\delta$ can be contained in at most 9 4-flats U_j, since the 4-flats U_j containing L form a dual partial line spread in $\mathrm{PG}(6,\mathbb{F}_2)/L \cong \mathrm{PG}(4,\mathbb{F}_2)$.

Defining $c(\delta,t)$ as the maximum of the two bounds, we obtain the final bound $h(\delta)$ shown in the table.[62] □

With these lemmas at hand we can finish the proof of the theorem.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. It remains to show the upper bound $M \le 407$. First we consider the case $\delta_0 = \delta_1 = \delta_6 = \delta_7 = 0$. Using Lemmas 4.3, 4.4 and the corresponding bounds in the dual view, we have

$$M \le \max_{\substack{0\le\delta_2\le 41\\ 0\le\delta_5\le 41}} \delta_2 + F\Big(\min\big\{g(\delta_2),h(\delta_5)\big\},\min\big\{g(\delta_5),h(\delta_2)\big\}\Big) + \delta_5, \tag{14}$$

where $F(u_3,u_4)$ denotes the maximum of $\delta_3+\delta_4$ subject to $0 \le \delta_3 \le u_3$, $0 \le \delta_4 \le u_4$, $\delta_4 \le \delta_3$ and the constraints $\delta_4 \le 190$, $\delta_3 \le f(\delta_4)$ imposed by Lemma 4.2. It is easy to see that

$$F(u_3,u_4) = \min_{0\le\delta_4\le\min\{u_3,u_4,190\}} \min\big\{u_3, f(\delta_4)\big\} + \delta_4.$$

Substituting this into (14) gives a maximization problem which can be solved by exhaustive search (taking a few seconds on a current PC or notebook). There are two optimal solutions, viz. $(\delta_2^*,\delta_3^*,\delta_4^*,\delta_5^*) = (0,365,1,40)$ and $(0,365,0,41)$, with objective value $\delta_2^*+\delta_3^*+\delta_4^*+\delta_5^* = 406$.

Finally we consider the case where $\delta_0+\delta_1+\delta_6+\delta_7 > 0$. Since clearly $\delta_0+\delta_1 \le 1$ and $\delta_6+\delta_7 \le 1$, the proof can be finished by determining all solutions of (14) with $M \ge 405$. Apart from the two optimal solutions, these are $(\delta_2,\delta_3,\delta_4,\delta_5) = (0,365,1,39)$, $(0,365,2,38)$, $(0,366,2,37)$, $(0,366,3,36)$. Since all 6 dimension distributions have $\delta_5 > 0$, corresponding subspace codes, provided they exist, can be extended by at most one codeword of dimension 1. This gives the bound $M \le 407$ and completes the proof of the theorem. □

Remark 6. The proof of Theorem 4.1 shows that a subspace code meeting the bound in the theorem must have dimension distribution $(0,1,0,365,0,41,0,0)$ or $(0,1,0,365,1,40,0,0)$ (under the assumption $\delta_3 \ge \delta_4$), and its dimension-three layer $\mathcal{C}_3$ must leave one point P of $\mathrm{PG}(6,\mathbb{F}_2)$ uncovered. For $\mathcal{C}_3$ we have the bound $\delta_3 \le 372$, since none of the 63 lines through P can be covered by a plane in $\mathcal{C}_3$, but this is too weak to exclude the two dimension distributions. We can only say the following: Should a $(7,407,4)_2$ subspace code indeed exist, then its dimension-three layer cannot be extended to a 2-analogue of the Fano plane, since for subcodes of a putative 2-analogue leaving one point uncovered we have the stronger bound $M \le 360$.

4.2. **The Cases $(v,d) = (6,3)$ and $(7,3)$.** Etzion and Vardy obtained the lower bound $\mathrm{A}_2(6,3) \ge 85$ in [18], and in [15] Etzion conjectured that this lower bound could be raised by extending optimal $(6,M,4;3)_2$ constant-dimension codes. Since $\mathrm{A}_2(6,4;3) = 77$ and the optimal codes fall into 5 isomorphism types [32], we can easily compute the corresponding cardinality-maximal extensions:

- Types A, B: $\#\mathcal{C} \le 91$, with one particular realizable dimension distribution $\delta = (0,0,7,77,7,0,0)$;
- Type C: $\#\mathcal{C} \le 93$, with $\delta = (0,0,8,77,8,0,0)$;

[62] Using the second bound leads to an improvement of the final bound for $34 \le \delta \le 41$.

- Type D: $\#\mathcal{C} \leq 95$, with $\delta = (0, 0, 8, 77, 10, 0, 0)$;
- Type E: $\#\mathcal{C} \leq 95$, with $\delta = (0, 0, 11, 77, 7, 0, 0)$.

Restricting the allowed dimensions to $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, we obtain the following maximal extensions:

- Types A, B: $\#\mathcal{C} \leq 84$, with $\delta = (0, 0, 7, 77, 0, 0, 0)$;
- Type C: $\#\mathcal{C} \leq 86$, with $\delta = (0, 0, 9, 77, 0, 0, 0)$;
- Types D, E: $\#\mathcal{C} \leq 88$, with $\delta = (0, 0, 11, 77, 0, 0, 0)$.

Since $\mathrm{A}_2(6, 3; \{0, 1, 2\}) = \mathrm{A}_2(6, 3; \{4, 5, 6\}) = 21$, we have $\mathrm{A}_2(6, 3) \leq 77 + 2 \cdot 21 - 1 = 118$. Using an integer linear programming approach, combined with some heuristics, we found a $(6, 104, 3)_2$ code with dimension distribution $(0, 0, 17, 69, 18, 0, 0)$.

For the case $(v, d) = (7, 3)$ we have $\mathrm{A}_2(7, 3) \leq 776$ [2]. The previously best known lower bound was $\mathrm{A}_2(7, 3) \geq 584$ [16]. Using again an integer linear programming approach, one of the $(7, 329, 4; 3)_2$ constant-dimension codes from [31] can be extended by at least 262 four-dimensional codewords. Adding the null space and $\mathbb{F}_2^7$ yields the improved lower bound $\mathrm{A}_2(7, 3) \geq 329 + 262 + 1 + 1 = 593$.

4.3. **The Case** $(v, d) = (5, 4)$**.** For $v = 5$, $d = 4$, by Theorem 3.2 we have to consider the dimension distributions $(0, 0, 9, 0, 0, 0)$, $(0, 0, 8, 1, 0, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 8, 0, 1, 0)$, up to duality. The codes with dimension distribution $(0, 0, 9, 0, 0, 0)$ are exactly the $(5, 9, 4; 2)_2$ constant dimension codes or in other words, the partial line spreads of $\mathrm{PG}(4, \mathbb{F}_2)$ of size 9. Up to equivalence, there are 4 such partial spreads [24]; see also [32].

The codes realizing the remaining two dimension distributions contain a partial line spread $\mathcal{S}_8$ of size 8 as a subcode. Up to equivalence, there are 9 types of $\mathcal{S}_8$, all contained in some maximal partial line spread $\mathcal{S}_9$ of size 9 [24, Sect. 5.2]. For the dimension distribution $(0, 0, 8, 1, 0, 0)$, the plane Y_0 represented by the unique codeword of dimension 3 must be disjoint from each of the 8 lines in $\mathcal{S}_8$. Thus, these codes $\mathcal{C}$ are exactly the partitions of V into 8 lines and a single plane. Extending $\mathcal{S}_8$ by a line $X_0 \subset Y_0$, we get an $\mathcal{S}_9$ having a moving line X_0 in the sense of Section 3.2 or, using the terminology of [24], an $\mathcal{S}_9$ of regulus type X with the 4 reguli sharing the line X_0. Thus the $\mathcal{S}_8$ contained in $\mathcal{C}$ is the unique regulus-free partial spread (regulus type O in [24]). If follows that up to equivalence there is a unique code with dimension distribution $(0, 0, 8, 1, 0, 0)$. It is given by the lifted Gabidulin code $\mathcal{G}_{5,2,2}$ together with its special plane.

Now let $\mathcal{C}$ be a subspace code with dimension distribution $(0, 0, 8, 0, 1, 0)$. It has the form $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{S}_8 \cup \{H\}$ with a hyperplane (solid) H. The code $\mathcal{C}$ has minimum distance 4 if and only if for each line $L \in \mathcal{S}$, $\dim(L \cap H) = 1$. Consider a maximal partial spread $\mathcal{S}_9$ containing $\mathcal{S}_8$. Since H contains at most one line of $\mathcal{S}_9$, it must be one of the 3 solids containing the special plane Y_0 of $\mathcal{S}_9$ and contain exactly one line L of $\mathcal{S}_9$. If L is contained in Y_0, $\mathcal{S}_8$ has regulus type O and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{S}_8 \cup \{H\}$ has the type mentioned in the proof of Theorem 3.2(ii) with $H = Y$. Moreover, it is readily checked that the 3 possible choices for Y yield equivalent codes. If L is not contained in Y_0, then $H = L + Y_0$ and L is contained in 2 reguli of $\mathcal{S}_9$. This implies that $\mathcal{S}_8$ has regulus type II and is again uniquely determined [24]. Since H is determined by $\mathcal{S}_8$ (for example, as the span of the 7 holes of $\mathcal{S}_8$), $\mathcal{C}$ is uniquely determined as well.

In all we have seen that up to equivalence there are 2 subspace codes realizing the dimension distribution $(0, 0, 8, 0, 1, 0)$.

Altogether, there are $4 + 1 + 2 = 7$ types of $(5, 9, 4)_2$ subspace codes.

4.4. **The Case** $(v,d)=(5,3)$**.** For $v=5$, $d=3$, by Remark 4 we have to consider the dimension distributions $(0,0,9,9,0,0)$, $(0,1,8,8,1,0)$ and $(0,0,8,9,1,0)$, up to duality. So in each case, there is a subcode of dimension distribution $(0,0,9,0,0,0)$ or $(0,0,8,0,1,0)$ and subspace distance 4 (all dimensions of the codewords in the subcode have the same parity, so distance 3 implies distance 4). We have already seen that up to equivalence, the number of possibilities for this subcode is 4 or 2, respectively. For these 6 starting configurations, we enumerated all extensions to a code of size 18 by a clique search [42]. The resulting codes have been filtered for equivalence using nauty. In the end, we got the following numbers of equivalence classes: For $\delta=(0,0,9,9,0,0)$, there are 17708 codes, among them 306 self-dual ones. For $\delta=(0,1,8,8,1,0)$, there are 2164 codes, among them 73 self-dual ones. For $\delta=(0,0,8,9,1,0)$, there are 4426 codes, of course none of them self-dual. In total, there are $17708+2164+4426=24298$ types of $(5,9,3)_2$ subspace codes.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Tuvi Etzion for comments regarding the upper bound in Theorem 4.1 and to two anonymous reviewers for valuable comments and corrections.

The first author would like to thank the organizers of ALCOMA 15 for the invitation to the conference, giving him the opportunity to spend a very pleasant and academically rewarding week at Kloster Banz.

References

[1] R. Ahlswede and H. Aydinian, *On error control codes for random network coding*, Network Coding, Theory, and Applications, 2009. NetCod'09. Workshop on, IEEE, 2009, pp. 68–73.
[2] C. Bachoc, A. Passuello, and F. Vallentin, *Bounds for projective codes from semidefinite programming*, Advances in mathematics of communications **7** (2013), no. 2, 127–145.
[3] J. De Beule and L. Storme (eds.), *Current research topics in Galois geometry*, Nova Science Publishers, 2011.
[4] A. Beutelspacher, *Partial spreads in finite projective spaces and partial designs*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **145** (1975), 211–230, Corrigendum, ibid. 147:303, 1976.
[5] M. Braun and J. Reichelt, *q-analogs of packing designs*, Journal of Combinatorial Designs **22** (2014), no. 7, 306–321.
[6] P.J. Cameron and J.H. van Lint, *Graphs, codes and designs*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, no. 43, Cambridge University Press, 1980, A revised edition of these notes is [7].
[7] ———, *Designs, graphs, codes and their links*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, no. 22, Cambridge University Press, 1991, Revised edition of [6].
[8] A. Cossidente, F. Pavese, and L. Storme, *Optimal subspace codes in $PG(4,q)$*, in preparation (2015).
[9] T. Czerwinski and D. Oakden, *The translation planes of order twenty-five*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A **59** (1992), no. 2, 193–217.
[10] P. Delsarte, *Bilinear forms over a finite field, with applications to coding theory*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A **25** (1978), 226–241.
[11] P. Dembowski, *Finite geometries*, Springer-Verlag, 1968, Classics in Mathematics Series, 1997.
[12] U. Dempwolff, *Translation planes of order 27*, Designs, Codes and Cryptography **4** (1994), no. 2, 105–121, Erratum ibid. 5(1):81, 1995.
[13] U. Dempwolff and A. Reifart, *The classification of the translation planes of order 16, I*, Geometriae Dedicata **15** (1983), no. 2, 137–153.
[14] J. Eisfeld and L. Storme, *(partial) t-spreads and minimal t-covers in finite projective spaces*, Lecture notes, Ghent University, 2000.
[15] T. Etzion, *Problems on q-analogs in coding theory*, Preprint arXiv: 1305.6126, 37 pages, 2013.
[16] T. Etzion and N. Silberstein, *Codes and designs related to lifted MRD codes, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **59** (2013), no. 2, 1004–1017.*

[17] T. Etzion and L. Storme, *Galois geometries and coding theory*, Designs, Codes and Cryptography (2015), 1–40.
[18] T. Etzion and A. Vardy, *Error-correcting codes in projective space*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **57** (2011), no. 2, 1165–1173.
[19] T. Feulner, *The automorphism groups of linear codes and canonical representatives of their semilinear isometry classes*, Advances in Mathematics of Communications **3** (2009), no. 4, 363–383.
[20] T. Feulner, *Canonical Forms and Automorphisms in the Projective Space*, Preprint arXiv:1305.1193, 37 pages, 2013.
[21] T. Feulner, *Eine kanonische Form zur Darstellung äquivalenter Codes – Computergestützte Berechnung und ihre Anwendung in der Codierungstheorie, Kryptographie und Geometrie*, PhD thesis, Universität Bayreuth, 2014.
[22] E.M. Gabidulin and M. Bossert, *Algebraic codes for network coding*, Problems of Information Transmission **45** (2009), no. 4, 343–356.
[23] Janos Galambos and Italo Simonelli, *Bonferroni-type inequalities with applications*, Springer-Verlag, 1996.
[24] N.A. Gordon, R. Shaw, and L.H. Soicher, *Classification of partial spreads in* PG(4, 2), available online as `http://www.maths.qmul.ac.uk/~leonard/partialspreads/PG42new.pdf`, 2004.
[25] X. Guang and Z. Zhang, *Linear network error correction coding*, SpringerBriefs in Computer Science, Springer-Verlag, 2014.
[26] M. Hall, Jr., J.D. Swift, and R.J. Walker, *Uniqueness of the projective plane of order eight*, Mathematics of Computation **10** (1956), no. 56, 186–194.
[27] D. Heinlein, M. Kiermaier, S. Kurz and A. Wassermann, Tables of subspace codes, 2016, Preprint arXiv:1601.02864 [math.CO].
[28] J.W.P. Hirschfeld, *Finite projective spaces of three dimensions*, Oxford University Press, 1985.
[29] ———, *Projective geometries over finite fields*, 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, 1998.
[30] J.W.P. Hirschfeld and Joseph A. Thas, *General Galois geometries*, Oxford University Press, 1991.
[31] T. Honold and M. Kiermaier, *On putative q-analogues of the Fano plane and related combinatorial structures*, Preprint arXiv:1504.06688, 37 pages, 2015.
[32] T. Honold, M. Kiermaier, and S. Kurz, *Optimal binary subspace codes of length* 6*, constant dimension* 3 *and minimum subspace distance* 4, Topics in Finite Fields. 11th International Conference on Finite Fields and their Applications, July 22–26, 2013, Magdeburg, Germany (Gohar Kyureghyan, Gary L. Mullen, and Alexander Pott, eds.), Contemporary Mathematics, vol. 632, American Mathematical Society, 2015, pp. 157–176.
[33] T. Honold, M. Kiermaier and S. Kurz, Classification of large partial plane spreads in $\mathrm{PG}(6, \mathbb{F}_2)$ and related combinatorial objects, 2016, in preparation.
[34] N.L. Johnson, V. Jha, and M. Biliotti, *Handbook of finite translation planes*, CRC Press, 2007.
[35] D.J. Kleitman, *On an extremal property of antichains in partial orders. the lym property and some of its implications and applications*, Combinatorics, Springer, 1975, pp. 277–290.
[36] R. Koetter and F. Kschischang, *Coding for errors and erasures in random network coding*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **54** (2008), no. 8, 3579–3591.
[37] H. Liu and T. Honold, *Poster: A new approach to the main problem of subspace coding*, 9th International Conference on Communications and Networking in China (ChinaCom 2014, Maoming, China, Aug. 14–16), 2014, Full paper available as arXiv:1408.1181, pp. 676–677.
[38] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1977.
[39] R. Mathon and G.F. Royle, *The translation planes of order 49*, Designs, Codes and Cryptography **5** (1995), no. 1, 57–72.
[40] B. D. McKay and A. Piperno, *Practical graph isomorphism II*, Journal of Symbolic Computation **60** (2014), 94–112.
[41] G.E. Moorhouse, *Two-graphs and skew two-graphs in finite geometries*, Linear Algebra and its Applications **226–228** (1995), 529–551.
[42] S. Niskanen and P.R.J. Östergård, *Cliquer User's Guide, Version 1.0*, Communications Laboratory, Helsinki University of Technology, Espoo, Finland, Tech. Rep. T48, 2003.
[43] D. Silva, F. Kschischang, and R. Koetter, *A rank-metric approach to error control in random network coding*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **54** (2008), no. 9, 3951–3967.

[44] ———, *Communication over finite-field matrix channels*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **56** (2010), no. 3, 1296–1306.
[45] A.-L. Trautmann, *Isometry and automorphisms of constant dimension codes*, Advances in Mathematics of Communications **7** (2013), no. 2, 147–160.
[46] J.H. van Lint and R.M. Wilson, *A course in combinatorics*, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
[47] R.W. Yeung and N. Cai, *Network error correction, part I: Basic concepts and upper bounds*, Communications in Information and Systems **6** (2006), no. 1, 19–35.
[48] ———, *Network error correction, part II: Lower bounds*, Communications in Information and Systems **6** (2006), no. 1, 37–54.

E-mail address: honold@zju.edu.cn
E-mail address: michael.kiermaier@uni-bayreuth.de
E-mail address: sascha.kurz@uni-bayreuth.de